



**HAL**  
open science

# Does the yield curve signal recessions? New evidence from an international panel data analysis

Jean-Baptiste Hasse, Quentin Lajaunie

## ► To cite this version:

Jean-Baptiste Hasse, Quentin Lajaunie. Does the yield curve signal recessions? New evidence from an international panel data analysis. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 2022, 84, pp.9-22. 10.1016/j.qref.2022.01.001 . hal-03740235

**HAL Id: hal-03740235**

**<https://amu.hal.science/hal-03740235>**

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

# Does the Yield Curve Signal Recessions? New Evidence from an International Panel Data Analysis. \*

Jean-Baptiste Hasse<sup>a,b</sup>, Quentin Lajaunie<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Aix-Marseille Univ., CNRS, EHESS, Centrale Marseille, AMSE, Marseille, France*

<sup>b</sup>*Université Catholique de Louvain, LFIN, Belgium*

<sup>c</sup>*University of Orléans, LEO, France*

---

## Abstract

In this paper, we reexamine the predictive power of the yield spread across countries and over time. Using a dynamic panel/dichotomous model framework and a unique dataset covering 13 OECD countries over the period 1975-2019, we empirically show that the yield spread signals recessions. This result is robust to different econometric specifications, controlling for recession risk factors and time sampling. Using a new cluster analysis methodology, we present empirical evidence of a partial homogeneity of the predictive power of the yield spread. Our results provide a valuable framework for monitoring economic cycles.

*Keywords:* Yield Spread; Recession; Panel Binary Model; Cluster Analysis.

*JEL Classification:* C23; C25; E37; E43; E52; E58.

---

---

\*The authors thank Bertrand Candelon, Yin-Wong Cheung, Menzie Chinn, Elena Ivona Dumitrescu, Laurent Ferrara, Christophe Hurlin, Yannick Le Pen, Valérie Mignon and Chris Neely and seminar participants at the 69th Congress of the French Economic Association (AFSE, 2021), the 2020 Winter Meetings of the Econometric Society (University of Nottingham, 2020), the 15th International Conference on Computational and Financial Econometrics - CFE (King's College, 2020) and the 19th Econometrics Day (University of Paris Nanterre, 2020) for helpful comments. This research was performed as part of a research program titled "Risk Management, Investment Strategies and Financial Stability" under the aegis of the Europlace Institute of Finance, a joint initiative with insti7. The usual disclaimer applies.

*Email addresses:* [jean-baptiste.hasse@univ-amu.fr](mailto:jean-baptiste.hasse@univ-amu.fr) (Jean-Baptiste Hasse),  
[quentin\\_lajaunie@hotmail.fr](mailto:quentin_lajaunie@hotmail.fr) (Quentin Lajaunie)

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we reexamine the predictive power of the yield spread in a unique dataset covering 13 OECD countries over a period of 45 years. Using a binary panel model, we estimate the relationship between yield spreads and future recessions, controlling for monetary policy stance and seven other recession risk factors selected from the recent literature. Our results, robust to different econometric specifications and time sampling, confirm that yield spreads signal recessions. Ten countries out of thirteen are concentrated in two clusters only and the predictive power of the yield curve appears to be unrelated to central bank policy rates, while cluster distribution could be linked to monetary policy frameworks (inflation targeting or alternative policy frameworks). The relationship between the term spread and future recessions is well-known; the yield curve has been monitored to detect recession signs for several decades (Wheelock and Wohar, 2009). However, some concerns have been raised about the homogeneity and the stability of the predictive power of the yield spread across countries and over time. On the one hand, the predictive power of the term spread appears to have declined since the early 1990s: monetary policy changes, the long-term interest rate conundrum and the zero lower bound have been identified as potential roots of this new regime (Chauvet and Potter, 2005). On the other hand, little is known about the predictive power of the yield spread outside the US. Indeed, most of the literature focuses on the US, while only a few authors extend empirical studies to several countries (Estrella and Mishkin, 1997; Bernard and Gerlach, 1998; Ahrens, 2002; Moneta, 2005; Chinn and Kucko, 2015).

Concerns about stability and homogeneity of the predictive power of the yield curve have raised questions regarding the economic roots of the relationship between interest rates' spread and business cycles. The term spread's evolution has long been linked to business cycles and thus has been used as a valuable tool for monitoring such cycles. Kessel (1965) documented the cyclical behavior of the yield spread, he investigated the common variation of the term structure of interest rates and business cycles. Specifically, the author showed that the yield spread tended to decline immediately before a recession. Similarly, Fama (1986)

noted that the [slope](#) of the yield curve changed relative to expansion or recession periods. The author argued that this relationship could be consistent with the liquidity preference hypothesis and could be explained in an intertemporal CAPM framework. Considering the Fisher's expectation hypothesis for the term structure of interest rates,<sup>1</sup> Harvey (1988) provided analytical evidence that the yield spread was related to future consumption growth. The yield spread had more explanatory power than lagged consumption growth and lagged stock returns. This result supported the idea that investors' expectations of future expansion or recession could impact the [slope](#) of the yield curve. More recently, Estrella (2005) built an analytical rational expectations model to investigate the theoretical roots of the usefulness of the yield curve as a predictor of output growth. The yield curve was a function of parameters of the monetary policy rule. Thus, the predictive power of the yield curve could not be said to be structural.

The vast majority of the literature focuses on assessing the empirical relationship between the term spread and the probability of future recessions. Estrella and Hardouvelis (1991) and Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008) have enhanced the use of binary regression models (probit and logit models) in a univariate framework. This empirical literature focuses on the US, even if a few papers use data for other countries. We reexamine the predictive power of the yield curve in an international panel data analysis. Specifically, this paper addresses two econometric challenges: (i) moving to a dynamic binary balanced panel framework, and (ii) proposing a clustering method for the new framework. Finally, our contribution to the literature is threefold: (i) introducing a unique database including a set of eight country-level recession risk factors, and covering 13 industrialized countries over 45 years at a monthly frequency, (ii) confirming the predictive power of the yield curve in an international panel data framework, and (iii) investigating the potential homogeneity of this predictive power across countries.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on the

---

<sup>1</sup>See Dimand and Gomez Betancourt (2012) for a historical perspective.

predictive power of the yield curve across countries and over time. Section 3 introduces a dynamic panel/dichotomous model framework, which is accompanied by a clustering analysis (e.g., Zhang et al. 2019). Section 4 describes the empirical results. Finally, we summarize the results for policymakers and forecasters and highlight monetary policy implications.

## 2. Literature

The economists' consensus based on a large body of empirical evidence is that binary response models perform well in forecasting future probabilities of recessions. However, the future predictive power of the yield spread remains fragile, as it is not structural but related to monetary policy (Estrella, 2005). Specifically, the predictive power of the yield spread is a function of the parameters of the monetary policy rule. Such parameters are based on policy objectives (money supply targeting, inflation targeting or price level targeting) that could change over time and across monetary areas. Thus, the relevance of generalizing the use of yield spreads in forecasting recessions relies on both the stability and homogeneity of their relationship.

### *2.1. Stability of the predictive power of the yield spread over time*

On the one hand, the literature has been enriched with several empirical papers investigating the effects of structural breaks in monetary policy. Including a Markov-switching coefficient variation in the probit model, Dueker (1997) and Ahrens (2002) both reject the linearity hypothesis. Both authors observe significant regimes, and in particular, the results of Ahrens (2002) indicate that the two estimated regimes are associated with expansions and recessionary periods. However, the results of Estrella et al. (2003) and Wright (2006) indicate that binary models of expansion-recession provide more stable estimates than does a continuous model of GDP growth. In a dynamic probit model framework, Chauvet and Potter (2002, 2005) and Bellégo and Ferrara (2009) show that time-varying probit models improve in-sample fitting. However, following the modeling framework of Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008), Ng (2012) and more recently Hwang (2019), we provide the opposite evidence

(see Rudebusch and Williams 2009 for a discussion of the puzzle of the enduring predictive power of the yield spread). While a proper econometric specification is important, the choice of control variables is also crucial. Exploring this, Wright (2006) shows that using both the central bank rates and term spreads can result in better predictive performance than term spreads alone. Indeed, this variable can be used to disentangle the origins of yield spread variations that could be related to variations in short- and/or long-term yields. Other macroeconomic variables have predictive power and can improve recession forecasting accuracy. First, Nyberg (2010) provides empirical evidence of the usefulness of stock market returns and the foreign term spread. These additional variables can capture the monetary policy stance but cannot be indicators of other potential risk factors for recessions. A subsequent study by Ng (2012) extends previous analyses by incorporating a more complete set of recession risk factors (financial market expectations of a gloomy economic outlook, credit or liquidity risks in the general economy, the risks of negative wealth effects resulting from the bursting of asset price bubbles, and signs of deteriorating macroeconomic fundamentals).<sup>2</sup> In a more recent study, Park et al. (2020) replicated the results of Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008) obtained with a parametric linear dynamic probit model. Extending the data up to 2017, the researchers validated the results using both parametric and nonparametric validation approaches. To improve probit models' fitting in the US, other variables have also been suggested, such as sentiment (Christiansen et al., 2014), credit (Ponka, 2017), liquidity (Ng, 2012), money supply variables (Hwang, 2019), volatility index (VIX) (Adrian et al., 2010) and economic policy uncertainty (Karnizova and Li, 2014).

---

<sup>2</sup>The authors use macroeconomic and financial indicators to proxy the five risk factors: the yield spread, the TED spread (the interest rate differential between 3-month LIBOR and 3-month T-bills), the equity price index, the housing price index, and a macroleading index.

## *2.2. Homogeneity of the predictive power of the yield spread across countries*

On the other hand, while the early literature focused on the US, more recent empirical studies have investigated the predictive power of the yield spread in an international framework. The objective is to assess the homogeneity of the relationship between the yield spread and probability of recessions across countries. For instance, Bernard and Gerlach (1998) and Ahrens (2002) perform the first international analyses. Their respective data samples cover nine countries: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, the UK and the US. The authors' cross-country analyses highlight that the yield spread predicts future recessions in all countries. However, the authors point out that its information content differs from one country to another. For instance, the predictive power of the term spread is greater in Canada, Germany and the US than in Japan, Italy or the Netherlands. To a lesser extent, Estrella et al. (2003) and Sensier et al. (2004) focus on the US and several European countries and observe that the overall patterns in the countries in the chosen set are similar. Duarte et al. (2005) and Moneta (2005) focus on the Euro area and obtain results that confirm the usefulness of the yield spread in predicting the likelihood of a future recession in the Euro area (see also Estrella and Mishkin 1997). Moneta's results also emphasize that the German and French yield spreads are the most significant signals of recession in the Euro area and that country-level data provide better forecasting performance than aggregated data.

Chinn and Kucko (2015) recently built the largest database covering nine countries (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK and the US) over the 1970–2013 period. The results of the researchers' review of the predictive power of the yield curve indicate that probit models are a relatively good fit for the United States, Germany and Canada over the entire dataset, while the remaining models largely failed to anticipate the recessions of the 2000s. The models for Japan and Italy did not predict recessions well. While the literature is dominated by univariate time series analyses, a few papers deviate from this approach. For instance, Wright (2006) and King et al. (2007) use a bivariate time series approach to show that adding federal funds rates and credit spreads, respectively,

as macroeconomic variables improves probit models' estimations in the US. Interestingly, the attempt of Ozturk and Pereira (2013) to reexamine the predictive power of the yield spread using a panel approach is, as far as we know, the first empirical study trying to compare the empirical results of probit models in an international framework. However, the researchers' results are weakened by several drawbacks pertaining to econometric and data issues.<sup>3</sup>

### 3. Using a yield spread to predict recessions

#### 3.1. Model

We aim to estimate the probability at time  $t - 1$  that the economy will fall into recession at time  $t$ . A discrete variable  $y_t$  takes the value 1 if the economy is in recession at time  $t$ , and 0 otherwise. A recession is a function of some continuous latent variable,  $\pi_t$ , which is a function of vectors of explanatory variables,  $x_{t-1}$ , and parameters,  $\beta$ :

$$y_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \pi_t > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \pi_t \leq 0 \end{cases} . \quad (1)$$

Estrella and Hardouvelis (1991), Estrella and Mishkin (1997, 1998) and Bernard and Gerlach (1998) were the first to estimate the probability that a recession occurs at time  $t$  with a simple probit model, using the spread between the three-month and ten-year yields and macroeconomic variables to improve the quality of the regression. The model takes the following form:

---

<sup>3</sup>Unfortunately, the empirical study of Ozturk and Pereira (2013) is based on unbalanced panel data: the researchers use a static binary model only, and their results are subject to statistical biases. Their modeling approach could have been dramatically improved using econometric specifications introduced in Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008) (i.e., using a dynamic dichotomous model with a lagged binary variable, a lagged index variable or both). Additionally, their estimations could have been adjusted for cross-sectional dependence using the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998).



$$Pr_{t-1}(y_t = 1) = F(\pi_t) = F(x_{t-1}\beta) \text{ for } t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (2)$$

where  $T$  represents the number of time series observations. Dependent variable  $y_t$  is a  $[t - 1]$  vector,  $x_{t-1}$  is a  $[(t - 1) \times k]$  matrix that represents explanatory variables,  $k$  is the number of explanatory variables,  $\beta$  is a  $[k]$  vector that contains the set of estimated coefficients, and  $F(\cdot)$  is a transformation function.<sup>4</sup>

Chauvet and Potter (2005) proposed an improvement in estimating this relationship, adding a latent continuous stochastic process and a coefficient associated with the error term. This explanatory variable has two important purposes. First, as a new source of information, it can improve the quality of the estimation. Second, it also allows a time-varying parameter by taking into account the dependence on the latent variable. Furthermore, Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008) added a lagged dependent variable. Indeed, if a country is in recession at time  $t$ , because of persistence of the crisis, then the probability of the country staying in recession during the following period must be impacted accordingly. Then, a dynamic dichotomous model takes the following form:

$$Pr_{t-1}(y_t = 1) = F(\pi_t) = F(x_{t-1}\beta + \alpha y_{t-1} + \delta \pi_{t-1}), \text{ for } t = 1, 2, \dots, T. \quad (3)$$

The parameters are the same as those defined in equation (2). The innovation of Chauvet and Potter (2005) and Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008) consists of the addition of two variables – the lagged index variable  $\pi_{t-1}$  and the lagged dependent variable  $y_{t-1}$  – with their associated coefficients  $\delta$  and  $\alpha$ .

Bernard and Gerlach (1998) studied the possibility of using the yield curve to predict future economic activity in 8 countries. More recently, Chinn and Kucko (2015) reexamined this evidence using a dataset covering 9 countries. The above papers estimated this relation-

---

<sup>4</sup> $F(\cdot)$  is a Gaussian c.d.f for the probit model and a logistic c.d.f. for the logit model.

ship for each country separately from the others. Instead, a panel approach is preferred that would estimate the impact of an explanatory variable on a set of countries: a panel approach improves power if the homogeneity restrictions hold. Candelon et al. (2014) proposed extending the model of Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008) to panel data. This model is written as follows:

$$Pr_{t-1}(y_{i,t} = 1) = F(\pi_{i,t}) = F(x_{i,t-1}\beta + \alpha y_{i,t-1} + \delta \pi_{i,t-1} + \eta_i),$$

for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ , and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , (4)

where  $N$  is the number of countries in the panel, and  $\eta_i$  is a country fixed effect for the control of unobserved heterogeneity and potential bias.

The first innovation of this paper extends approaches of Bernard and Gerlach (1998) and Chinn and Kucko (2015) with a dynamic logit panel model.<sup>5</sup> As far as we know, a balanced panel framework has never been used to study the relationship between yield spreads and recessions. Here, we propose extending such studies by evaluating a set of 13 countries over the period of 1975-2019, following the methodology proposed recently by Candelon et al. (2014). Furthermore, we follow Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008), and we estimate four models. The first model is a static logit model with two restrictions:  $\alpha = \delta = 0$  (Model 1). In this case, only the exogenous macroeconomic variables affect the future occurrence of a crisis. The second and third models are dynamic and include either a lagged value of the binary variable  $y_{t-1}$  with a restriction on  $\delta = 0$  (Model 2) or a lagged index  $\pi_{t-1}$  with a restriction on  $\alpha = 0$  (Model 3). Finally, the last dynamic model combines the two preceding cases and includes both a lagged binary variable  $y_{t-1}$  and a lagged index  $\pi_{t-1}$  (Model 4). The model

---

<sup>5</sup>The logistic c.d.f. is preferred to a Gaussian c.d.f, as it is more appropriate for the study of extreme events such as crises (Kumar et al., 2003).

that minimizes the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) is chosen as the best model.

Candelon et al. (2014) show that the four different alternatives of the model presented in equation 4 can be estimated under the same exact maximum likelihood (EML) framework. The log-likelihood function has the following general form:

$$\text{LogL}(\theta, \eta_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{LogL}_i(\theta, \eta_i) \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T [y_{i,t} \log(F(\pi_{i,t}(\theta, \eta_i))) + (1 - y_{i,t}) \log(1 - F(\pi_{i,t}(\theta, \eta_i)))]. \quad (6)$$

However, the panel approach may have some constraints. The assumption of homogeneity of all the parameters may be too restrictive despite the presence of the fixed effects capturing the heterogeneity. In the last few years, heterogeneous panels have been the main focus of attention in the literature. Many studies have examined slope homogeneity and poolability in the panel data. Within this framework, Blomquist and Westerlund (2013) have extended the test of Pesaran and Yamagata (2008); however, their test does not deal with the practically relevant case of cross-sectional dependence and does not allow a dependence between the set of predictors and unobservable errors. Ando and Bai (2015b) proposed an alternative solution using the results of Bai (2009), Su and Chen (2013) and Ando and Bai (2015a) by incorporating interactive fixed effects.

Another approach to deal with heterogeneous panel data is related to the existence of homogeneous subgroups. Indeed, Van den Berg et al. (2008) explained that pooling all available countries into a single panel model may not be optimal and should be supplemented by studying the existence of clusters. Thus, to improve on the existing methods in predicting recessions from the yield curve, the second innovation of this paper consists of the identification of subgroups with homogeneous slopes. Our purpose is to deal with the potential issue of heterogeneity in order to complete and validate our panel approach. As emphasized by Van den Berg et al. (2008), two methods are currently frequently used in the literature

to ensure the poolability of data. The first method, called the "regional model", consists of estimating subgroups by geographical area. This method assumes that dichotomous variables are subject to change similarly and simultaneously across a given geographical region. The second method, called the "cluster model", only includes countries that can be statistically pooled. Such statistical approaches are usually based on Hausman (1978)'s homogeneity test. For instance, Kapetanios (2003) proposed an iterative procedure to determine optimal clusters with regard to their respective homogeneity. Following this approach, Candelon et al. (2014) used both regional and statistical approaches. In this paper, we introduce a new clustering procedure aiming to minimize residuals rather than favoring homogeneity within the subgroups. Specifically, our innovative methodology aims to determine optimal clusters of countries with regard to the Pearson residuals.<sup>6</sup> This econometric innovation enables an alternative clustering analysis aimed at investigating the homogeneity of the slopes.

Inspired by the approach proposed by Zhang et al. (2019), we have developed a two-stage approach involving a dichotomous dynamic model. In their paper, Zhang et al. (2019) proposed a method for panel data where fixed effects were estimated upstream. Such fixed effect, once estimated, is subtracted from the explanatory variable (Lin and Ng, 2012). Afterwards, the parameters of the regression are estimated by minimizing over all possible partitions of  $N$  units into  $G$  groups. In our case, since the dependent variable is a binary variable that only takes values of 1 or 0, we cannot simply subtract the fixed effect. Hence, to estimate our clustering logit model, we first estimate the logit model for each country to obtain the intercept for each of them (i.e., unobserved individual effect). Subsequently, we estimate the group-specific parameters  $\theta_g$  for  $g = 1, \dots, G$  while constraining the previously estimated fixed effects, where  $\theta_g = [\beta_g \ \alpha_g \ \delta_g]$  and  $G$  is not fixed beforehand. Thus, without subtracting

---

<sup>6</sup>Because we perform clustering logistic panel analysis, the use of Pearson residuals is preferable. See Agresti (2018), section 5.2.4, p. 147-148. Our method aims to minimize these residuals, also called standardized residuals.

the fixed effects from the explanatory variable (Lin and Ng, 2012), this method enables us to offer an alternative for dichotomous models.

Let  $\Theta = \{\theta_g : 1, \dots, G\}$  be the set comprising all group-specific slopes and  $\gamma = \{g_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$  be the set of group memberships for  $N$  units. Thus,  $\gamma \in F_G$  denotes a particular partition of  $N$  units, where  $F_G$  is the set of all partitions of  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  into  $G$  groups. Let  $\Psi$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\Theta$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . In the first stage, we fit the logit regression for each unit and estimate the fixed effect  $\eta_i$  by  $\tilde{\eta}_i$ , where

$$(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{\eta}_i) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\eta \in \Psi, \theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{i,t} - F(\theta' X_{i,t} + \eta)). \quad (7)$$

Next, following Zhang et al. (2019), we estimate the group memberships and the group-specific parameters by

$$(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\gamma}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta, \gamma \in F_G} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{i,t} - F(\theta'_g X_{i,t} + \tilde{\eta}_i)). \quad (8)$$

In the second step (equation 8), we select  $\theta$  that minimizes Pearson residuals over all possible partitions of  $N$  units into  $G$  groups and the group-specific parameters from a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . The estimation procedure is summarized in Appendix 1. This allows us to cluster our sample of countries into homogeneous country groups. Moreover, the existence of groups of several countries allows us to test the partial homogeneity of our sample. As  $G$  is not initially fixed, the number of groups obtained from our method will be the one that allows the Pearson residuals to be minimized.

### 3.2. Data

Our objective is to reexamine the empirical relationship between the slope of the yield curve and future recessions. Our contribution is twofold: we aim to investigate (i) this relationship across countries and over time, and (ii) the cross-country homogeneity of the results. To do so, a dynamic panel data is clearly the most appropriate framework, as we aim to combine both cross-sectional and time series dimensions. Specifically, this approach is

relevant because we aim to control the impact of monetary policy on the predictive power of the yield curve as well as other recession risk factors. Furthermore, we choose a balanced panel framework. The motivation of this choice is that our specific contribution is to investigate the homogeneity of this relationship across countries. Indeed, the identification of subgroups of countries with heterogeneous predictive power of the yield spread is based on a regression-based clustering method that requires balanced panel data.

To match these data requirements, we introduce an extended and updated database that is, as far as we know, the largest balanced panel dataset for the yield spread - recession relationship. Our dataset includes 45 years of monthly data from 13 OECD countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, the UK and the US. We focus on the “10-year minus 3-month” interest rate spread because it is the most statistically significant predictor of recessions (Nyberg, 2010). However, our dataset differs from those discussed in the literature, as we do not focus on NBER and ECRI recession dummies for the US and other countries, respectively, but instead use OECD recession dummies. As a robustness check, we have performed the same estimations using the ECRI database.<sup>7</sup> This choice is motivated by the objective to cover as many countries as possible and the need to have similar measures for every country (see the methodology of Bry and Boschan 1971). Following Wright (2006), we also include central bank policy rates as a control variable. Indeed, this variable enables us not only to control for monetary policy but also to disentangle the origins of yield spread variations that could be related to variations of short- and/or long-term yields. As to macroeconomic control (“macro-control”) variables, we first include a set of recession risk factors as in Ng (2012), who introduces stock and housing markets’ prices, credit and liquidity spreads and a

---

<sup>7</sup>The results obtained using OECD and ECRI recession dummies are similar. We note that the ECRI database has a lower coverage than does the OECD database (in our case, the respective numbers of countries are 8 and 13). The results based on [alternative recession indicators are reported in Appendix 2](#).

macro-leading index. Instead of using a macro-leading indicator, we select a set of distinct macroeconomic variables. Specifically, we include proxies of (i) stock market returns as in Nyberg (2010), (ii) oil price returns as in Kilian and Vigfusson (2017), (iii) housing market returns as in Ng (2012), (iv) market sentiment as in Christiansen et al. (2014), (v) credit spread as in Ponka (2017), (vi) liquidity spread as in Ng (2012), (vii) economic policy uncertainty as in Karnizova and Li (2014) and (viii) volatility index (VIX) as in Adrian et al. (2010).

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the data and report the variables’ respective names, descriptions, codes, frequency, sources and references.

**Table 1:** Description of Panel Data: 1975-2019

| Variable            | Description  | Code        | Freq. |
|---------------------|--|-------------|-------|
| Recession           | Recession dummy indicator  | <i>REC</i>  | M     |
| Yield spread        | Difference between the long- and short-term government debt yields (10 Y minus 3 M)      | <i>YSPR</i> | M     |
| Central bank’s rate | Refinancing interest rate  | <i>CBAN</i> | M     |
| Stock market        | Stock market index   | <i>STOM</i> | M     |
| Crude oil market    | Brent spot price (USD/bbl)   | <i>OILM</i> | M     |
| Housing market      | Housing prices’ indicator  | <i>HOUM</i> | Q     |
| Sentiment           | Consumer sentiment and business trends’ surveys: Comp. Indicators                        | <i>SENT</i> | M     |
| Credit spread       | Difference between the interest rates of inter-bank loans and short-term government debt | <i>CSPR</i> | M     |
| Liquidity spread    | Difference between short-term government debt and central bank’s refinancing rate        | <i>LSPR</i> | M     |
| Uncertainty         | EPU index of Baker et al. (2016)   | <i>EPU</i>  | Q     |
| Volatility          | CBOE Volatility Index  | <i>VIX</i>  | M     |

**Notes:** This table provides each country-level variable’s name, description, code and frequency (“M” = monthly and “Q” = quarterly). The panel dataset covers 13 OECD countries over the period from January 1975 to March 2019.

**Table 2:** Sources of Panel Data

| Variable             | Sources       | References  |
|----------------------|---------------|---|
| Recession            | OECD and ECRI | Chinn and Kucko (2015)                                    |
| Yield spread         | OECD          | Nyberg (2010)   |
| Central banks' rates | BIS and OECD  | Wright (2006)   |
| Stock market         | Bloomberg     | Estrella and Mishkin (1998), Nyberg (2010)                |
| Crude oil market     | World Bank    | Engemann et al. (2011)<br>and Kilian and Vigfusson (2017) |
| Housing market       | OECD          | Ng (2012)   |
| Sentiment            | OECD          | Christiansen et al. (2014)                                |
| Credit spread        | OECD and FRED | Ponka (2017)  |
| Liquidity spread     | OECD and FRED | Ng (2012), Erdogan et al. (2015)                          |
| Uncertainty          | FRED          | Karnizova and Li (2014)                                   |
| Volatility           | FRED          | Adrian et al. (2010)                                      |

**Notes:** This table shows each country-level variable's name, source(s) and reference(s).

### 3.3. Empirical analysis

We reexamine the predictive power of the term spread in two steps. First, we investigate the relationship between the yield spread and future recessions in an international balanced panel. We then test the homogeneity of this relationship across countries via a cluster analysis. Consistently with previous studies, we use a binary model framework, preferring a logit model to a probit model as in Sensier et al. (2004), Moneta (2005) and more recently in Hwang (2019).<sup>8</sup> On this basis, we introduce some changes of the econometric specification. First, we have to adapt the binary regression model mostly used in a univariate fashion in the literature to a balanced panel framework using country fixed effects. Next, in regression estimation, we use the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) for cross-sectional dependence.<sup>9</sup> Using this augmented logit model, we run several regressions to estimate various binary

---

<sup>8</sup>Probit and logit are both binary regression models that exhibit very similar features. Considering the low ratio of ones to zeros that the recession dummy exhibits, logit models are preferable to probit models. See Naceur et al. (2019).

<sup>9</sup>Based on a univariate analysis, previous empirical studies use the correction of Newey and West (1987, 1994) instead.



models' specifications: a static logit model (Model 1), a dynamic logit model including the lagged recession dummy  $y_{t-1}$  (Model 2), a dynamic logit model including the lagged index  $\pi_{t-1}$  (Model 3), and a dynamic logit model including both the lagged recession dummy and the lagged index (Model 4). The results are reported in Table 3.

**Table 3:** Estimation results of panel logit models – Monthly frequency – 1975-2019

| Model                   | (1)                   | (2)                    | (3)                   | (4)                    |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| $YSPR_{-1}$             | -0.0821**<br>(0.0378) | -0.1648***<br>(0.0492) | -0.0719**<br>(0.0317) | -0.1833***<br>(0.0653) |
| $REC_{-1}$              |                       | 6.4657***<br>(0.1111)  |                       | 7.4607***<br>(0.1911)  |
| $Index_{-1}$            |                       |                        | -0.2416<br>(0.4383)   | -0.2808<br>(0.4773)    |
| Relevant Statistics     |                       |                        |                       |                        |
| $BIC$                   | 9,532.2               | 2,351.7                | 9,538.0               | 2,353.1                |
| Fixed Effects           |                       |                        |                       |                        |
| Country                 | Yes                   | Yes                    | Yes                   | Yes                    |
| <i>No. Observations</i> | 6,890                 | 6,890                  | 6,890                 | 6,890                  |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from static and dynamic logit models (1)-(4) for a panel of 13 countries covering the period from February 1975 to March 2019 at the monthly frequency with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *evs* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. The full reproducible code is available on CRAN. We report Bayesian (BIC) information criteria for each specification. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

The results in Table 3 indicate that the lagged yield spread and the lagged binary coefficients are both highly significant. Their coefficients are negative and positive, respectively, i.e., the yield spread is inversely related to the probability of future recessions, and the probability of being in recession at time  $t - 1$  is strongly related to the probability of being in recession at time  $t$ . In a period covering 45 years of monthly observations across 13 OECD countries, the predictive power of yield spread appears to be strong and significant. This predictive power is unaltered by the presence of a lagged binary variable or/and a lagged index. According to the BIC criteria,<sup>10</sup> we select model (2) that includes an intercept, the

---

<sup>10</sup>In the literature, the pseudo- $R^2$  measure has been the criterion most frequently used as a goodness-of-fit measure guiding the choice of the model and the optimal lag orders for explanatory variables (Estrella and Mishkin, 1998; Kauppi and Saikkonen, 2008). Following Candelon et al. (2012, 2014), we select the best econometric specification from BIC criteria.

lagged yield spread and the lagged binary variables. The next steps of this empirical study focus on this econometric specification.

The recent literature on the predictive power of the yield spread extensively explores the role of the macroeconomic environment. Following Nyberg (2010), Ng (2012), Christiansen et al. (2014), Karnizova and Li (2014), Engemann et al. (2011), Adrian et al. (2010), Kilian and Vigfusson (2017) and Ponka (2017), we extend the previously selected model (Model 2), adding several macro-control variables. These recession risk factors are added to Model 2 in different ways, depending on whether they are economic or financial variables. The results are reported in Table 4, where the two first columns indicate the regression results obtained with economic and financial control variables, respectively. Indeed, Ng and Wright (2013) document that recessions originate from monetary policy shocks or potentially in the financial markets. The last column reports the results of a regression of the augmented binary model with all macro-control variables.

**Table 4:** Estimation of a panel with macro-control variables – Monthly frequency – 1975-2019

| Model                     | Eco                    | Fin                    | Global                 |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>YSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -0.1691***<br>(0.0191) | -0.1799***<br>(0.0202) | -0.1886***<br>(0.0201) |
| <i>SENT</i> <sub>-1</sub> | 0.0808<br>(0.0497)     |                        | 0.1203***<br>(0.0427)  |
| <i>OILM</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -1.1146***<br>(0.398)  |                        | -0.8227*<br>(0.4782)   |
| <i>STOM</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        | -4.5252***<br>(0.4417) | -4.4755***<br>(0.4321) |
| <i>CSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        | 0.3732***<br>(0.0674)  | 0.3907***<br>(0.0648)  |
| <i>REC</i> <sub>-1</sub>  | 6.5082***<br>(0.0606)  | 6.4643***<br>(0.0429)  | 6.5388***<br>(0.0458)  |
| Relevant Statistics       |                        |                        |                        |
| <i>BIC</i>                | 2,365.4                | 2,335.8                | 2,348.7                |
| Fixed Effects             |                        |                        |                        |
| Country                   | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    |
| <i>No. Observations</i>   | 6,890                  | 6,890                  | 6,890                  |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from a dynamic logit model with a lagged binary variable for a panel of 13 countries over the period of 1975 – 2019 with one lag, and monthly frequency. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. We report Bayesian (BIC) information criteria for each specification. Using generalized linear model (GLM), the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) is applied so that standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

The results in Table 4 indicate that the coefficient of the lagged yield spread remains negative and significant. Consistently with the recent literature, the predictive power of the yield spread is robust to the introduction of macro-control variables. Specifically, coefficients of crude oil and stock market returns are negative and significant as in Engemann et al. (2011) and Ng (2012), respectively. The results also confirm the empirical results of Christiansen et al. (2014) and Ponka (2017), as both coefficients of sentiment and credit spread are positive and significant.

As a robustness check, we replicate this first empirical study in two steps. First, we use data at the quarterly frequency to test the predictive power of the yield spread in a longer run. Incidentally, using lower-frequency data enables us to enrich the model with two macro-control variables that are unavailable at the monthly frequency: housing market prices and economic policy uncertainty (see Table 5). Afterwards, we restrict the initial data sample to a temporal subsample from 1999, using lags of 1 and 3 (see Tables 6 and 7, respectively). Indeed, the recent literature reports structural breaks during the 1990s; additionally, the European Monetary Union adopted Euro in 1999. The results are reported in Tables 5, 6 and 7, respectively.

**Table 5:** Estimation of a panel with macro-control variables – Quarterly frequency – 1975-2019

| Model                     | Eco                    | Fin                    | Global                  |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>YSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -0.2138***<br>(0.0239) | -0.2228***<br>(0.0272) | -0.2434***<br>(0.0336)  |
| <i>SENT</i> <sub>-1</sub> | 0.1550**<br>(0.0636)   |                        | 0.2768***<br>(0.0755)   |
| <i>OILM</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -0.6416<br>(0.3931)    |                        | -0.4927*<br>(0.2705)    |
| <i>EPU</i> <sub>-1</sub>  | -0.5122<br>(0.6729)    |                        | -0.3384<br>(0.6800)     |
| <i>STOM</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        | -3.7137***<br>(1.4334) | -3.7778***<br>(1.4016)  |
| <i>CSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        | 0.2327***<br>(0.0678)  | 0.2685***<br>(0.0716)   |
| <i>HOUM</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        | -7.9327***<br>(1.6013) | -12.8603***<br>(3.2419) |
| <i>REC</i> <sub>-1</sub>  | 4.2201***<br>(0.0611)  | 4.063***<br>(0.0460)   | 4.2297***<br>(0.0841)   |
| Relevant Statistics       |                        |                        |                         |
| <i>BIC</i>                | 1,716.5                | 1,686.1                | 1,692.2                 |
| Fixed Effects             |                        |                        |                         |
| Country                   | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                     |
| <i>No. Observations</i>   | 2,275                  | 2,275                  | 2,275                   |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from a dynamic logit model with a lagged binary variable for a panel of 13 countries at the quarterly frequency over the period of 1975 – 2019 with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. We report Bayesian (BIC) information criteria for each specification. Using generalized linear model (GLM), the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) is applied so that standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

**Table 6:** Estimation of a panel with macro-control variables – Monthly frequency – 1999-2019

| Model                     | Eco                    | Eco Global             | Fin                    | Fin Global             | Global                 |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>YSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -0.3493***<br>(0.0857) | -0.2804***<br>(0.0752) | -0.3994***<br>(0.0857) | -0.4330***<br>(0.0693) | -0.4163***<br>(0.0710) |
| <i>CBAN</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        | 0.0692<br>(0.0765)     |                        | -0.0244<br>(0.0767)    | -0.0371<br>(0.0742)    |
| <i>SENT</i> <sub>-1</sub> | 0.0531<br>(0.0565)     | 0.0582<br>(0.06)       |                        |                        | 0.2302***<br>(0.0605)  |
| <i>OILM</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -1.4332<br>(1.2637)    | -1.5061<br>(1.3272)    |                        |                        | -1.0708<br>(1.4529)    |
| <i>STOM</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        |                        | -3.0940*<br>(1.7032)   | -3.0153*<br>(1.6762)   | -2.3735<br>(1.7645)    |
| <i>LSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        |                        |                        | -0.1422<br>(0.4824)    | -0.0712<br>(0.4395)    |
| <i>CSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        |                        | 0.5261***<br>(0.1279)  | 0.4145<br>(0.4495)     | 0.4782<br>(0.4034)     |
| <i>VIX</i> <sub>-1</sub>  |                        |                        | 0.0341**<br>(0.0142)   | 0.0376***<br>(0.0131)  | 0.0491***<br>(0.0114)  |
| <i>REC</i> <sub>-1</sub>  | 6.5139***<br>(0.0769)  | 6.531***<br>(0.0852)   | 6.3971***<br>(0.0562)  | 6.3859***<br>(0.0627)  | 6.4821***<br>(0.0621)  |
| Relevant Statistics       |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| <i>BIC</i>                | 1,165.6                | 1,172.6                | 1,157.7                | 1,173.5                | 1,184.7                |
| Fixed Effects             |                        |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| Country                   | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    |
| <i>No. Observations</i>   | 3,172                  | 3,172                  | 3,172                  | 3,172                  | 3,172                  |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from a dynamic logit model with a lagged binary variable for a panel of 13 countries over the period of 1999 – 2019 with one lag, and monthly frequency. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. We report Bayesian (BIC) information criteria for each specification. Using generalized linear model (GLM), the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) is applied so that standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *ews* (*vd.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

**Table 7:** Estimation of a panel with macro-control variables – Quarterly frequency – 1999-2019

| Model                     | Eco                    | Eco Global             | Fin                     | Fin Global              | Global                  |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>YSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -0.2844***<br>(0.0856) | -0.1876***<br>(0.0683) | -0.2905***<br>(0.0756)  | -0.2249***<br>(0.0546)  | -0.1806***<br>(0.0536)  |
| <i>CBAN</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        | 0.1014<br>(0.0796)     |                         | 0.0159<br>(0.0747)      | -0.01206<br>(0.0612)    |
| <i>SENT</i> <sub>-1</sub> | 0.2012***<br>(0.0604)  | 0.2121***<br>(0.0656)  |                         |                         | 0.5172***<br>(0.0556)   |
| <i>OILM</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -2.0676***<br>(0.4961) | -2.1877***<br>(0.5484) |                         |                         | -0.4707<br>(1.3111)     |
| <i>EPU</i> <sub>-1</sub>  | -2.2981**<br>(1.0894)  | -1.1563<br>(1.3624)    |                         |                         | -1.0933**<br>(0.5359)   |
| <i>STOM</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        |                        | -8.8147***<br>(0.8977)  | -9.0266***<br>(0.9178)  | -8.1991***<br>(0.8160)  |
| <i>LSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        |                        |                         | 0.8268***<br>(0.2668)   | 1.0324***<br>(0.2290)   |
| <i>CSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        |                        | 0.4089**<br>(0.1844)    | 1.0534***<br>(0.3204)   | 1.2680***<br>(0.2725)   |
| <i>HOUM</i> <sub>-1</sub> |                        |                        | -13.3674***<br>(3.2317) | -13.6075***<br>(3.5788) | -23.3889***<br>(2.7381) |
| <i>VIX</i> <sub>-1</sub>  |                        |                        | -0.0054<br>(0.0128)     | -0.0157<br>(0.0140)     | 0.0067<br>(0.0126)      |
| <i>REC</i> <sub>-1</sub>  | 4.2541***<br>(0.0752)  | 4.2642***<br>(0.0769)  | 4.1242***<br>(0.0704)   | 4.1681***<br>(0.0764)   | 4.4197***<br>(0.0843)   |
| Relevant Statistics       |                        |                        |                         |                         |                         |
| <i>BIC</i>                | 844.8                  | 850.3                  | 810.4                   | 821.2                   | 818.7                   |
| Fixed Effects             |                        |                        |                         |                         |                         |
| Country                   | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                     | Yes                     | Yes                     |
| <i>No. Observations</i>   | 1,040                  | 1,040                  | 1,040                   | 1,040                   | 1,040                   |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from a dynamic logit model with a lagged binary variable for a panel of 13 countries at the quarterly frequency over a period of 1999 – 2019 with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. We report Bayesian (BIC) information criteria for each specification. Using generalized linear model (GLM), the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) is applied so that standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

Compared to the previous results for the predictive power of the yield spread and the role of macro-control variables, the results in Tables 5, 6 and 7 are qualitatively similar. As in Table 4, we observe that the lagged yield spread’s coefficient remains negative and significant in each case. The predictive power of the term spread is altered neither if the lag is changed from 1 to 3 months nor by the introduction of two more macro-control variables (i.e., economic policy uncertainty (EPU), housing market prices and stock market volatility (VIX)). Moreover, the results for these recession risk factors reported in Table 5 are consistent with the literature. On the one hand, the lagged housing market prices’ coefficient is negative

and highly significant as in Ng (2012). Indeed, in the past 45 years, housing prices often declined before the start of most recessions, as did equity prices. On the other hand, the lagged EPU coefficient is not significant. This result is similar to those of Karnizova and Li (2014), who empirically show that EPU is only significant beyond 5 quarters. Hence, economic policy uncertainty does not seem to have a significant role in recessions in the short run (from 1 to 3 months). By the way, the VIX is not significant as in Adrian et al. (2010).

The results in Table 6 that reports regressions on a temporal subsample are similar to those described previously. Focusing on the period from 1999 to 2019, the results indicate that the predictive power of the yield spread is robust to time-sampling. The coefficient of the lagged yield spread is still highly significant and negative; however, we note that it is slightly smaller than it is for the entire sample at the quarterly frequency. This result supports the widespread idea that the predictive power of the yield curve has deteriorated during the 1990s. According to Chinn and Kucko (2015), this phenomenon stems from (i) changing links between interest rates and output, (ii) a failure of long-term interest rates to rise along with the short-term policy rate, and (iii) the zero lower bound (ZLB) implying that central banks try to lower long-term interest rates instead of lowering short-term rates.

To deal with this issue, we add another macro-control variable: the lagged central banks' rates as in Wright (2006). The purpose is to regress the yield spread, controlling for (i) the monetary policy stance and (ii) the level of short- and long-term yields at the same time.<sup>11</sup> In addition to central banks' rates, we also add the lagged liquidity spread as in Ng (2012). The results indicate that neither central bank rates nor liquidity risks are significant. The monetary policy stance, proxied by central bank rates, appears to have no short-term impact on the predictive power of the term spread.

---

<sup>11</sup>Referring to Wright (2006), Chinn and Kucko (2015) choose to use the 3-month yield instead of central banks' rate. Using this short-term yield enables the authors to easily control the level of yields to distinguish a rise in short-term yields and a drop in long-term yields, and vice versa.

In summary, the predictive power of the term spread has been reexamined using a panel dataset of 13 OECD countries over a period of more than 45 years. The results indicate that the yield spread is a valuable predictor of future recession in the short run. Specifically, the predictive power of the term spread is robust with respect to several econometric specifications, time sampling and, last but not least, a set of eight macro-control variables chosen in accordance with recent studies. Our approach is different from those in the literature due to the use of balanced panel data. Using these empirical results that are consistent with those of previous studies, we now aim to investigate the homogeneity of the predictive power of the yield curve. Indeed, Van den Berg et al. (2008) focused on the poolability issue for a panel and recommended the construction of country clusters using two different approaches. The first approach, called the "regional model", consists of identifying subgroups by geographical area, and the second approach, called the "cluster model", only includes countries that can be statistically pooled. Following this recommendation, Candelon et al. (2014) used both regional and statistical approaches (i.e., Kapetanios 2003). Following the latest publications, we first identify the regional and homogeneous clusters; the results are reported in Tables 8 and 9, respectively.

Then, we adapt the methodology of Zhang et al. (2019) to compute optimal clusters of entities in a balanced panel dataset. The purpose of this cluster analysis is to indirectly assess homogeneity of the predictive power of the yield spread across countries. If the optimal number of clusters is equal to the number of countries, then this cluster analysis would indicate that our results for the predictive power of the yield spread are highly heterogeneous across countries. If, on the contrary, the optimal number of clusters is equal to one, then we could presume that our results are highly homogeneous. Using the optimal number and composition of clusters, we further analyze the predictive power of the yield spread in each cluster. The results are reported in Table 10 and illustrated in Appendix 3.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Table 14 in Appendix 4 also includes all the estimations obtained from dynamic logit model (2) for each



**Table 8:** Estimation results of panel logit models – Regional clusters – Monthly frequency – 1999-2019

| Model                   | Asia & Oceania      | Europe  | America             |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| Country                 | AUS<br>JPN<br>NZL   | BEL<br>CHE<br>DEU<br>FRA<br>ITA<br>NLD<br>SWE<br>UK | CAN<br>USA          |
| $YSPR_{-1}$             | -0.130<br>(0.278)   | -0.379**<br>(0.165)                                 | -0.433<br>(0.337)   |
| $REC_{-1}$              | 6.203***<br>(0.346) | 6.662***<br>(0.242)                                 | 6.406***<br>(0.456) |
| $CBAN_{-1}$             | -0.057<br>(0.169)   | 0.102<br>(0.090)                                    | 0.048<br>(0.189)    |
| Relevant Statistics     |                     |   |                     |
| $BIC$                   | 293.72              | 686.09  | 199.53              |
| Fixed Effects           |                     |   |                     |
| Country                 | Yes                 | Yes   | Yes                 |
| <i>No. Observations</i> | 735                 | 1,960   | 490                 |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from a dynamic logit model with a lagged binary variable for a panel of 13 countries at the monthly frequency over the period of 1999 – 2019 with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. Using generalized linear model (GLM), the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) is applied so that standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. The full reproducible code is available on CRAN. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

**Table 9:** Estimation results of panel logit models – Kapetanios (2003) – Monthly frequency – 1999-2019

| Model                   | Group 1                                       | Group 2                 | Group 3             | Group 4             |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Country                 | BEL<br>CAN<br>CHE<br>DEU<br>ITA<br>JPN<br>USA | AUS<br>NZL<br>SWE<br>UK | NLD                 | FRA                 |
| $YSPR_{-1}$             | -0.314*<br>(0.170)                            | -0.171<br>(0.240)       | -0.932<br>(0.678)   | -0.875*<br>(0.460)  |
| $REC_{-1}$              | 6.479***<br>(0.243)                           | 6.470***<br>(0.328)     | 7.215***<br>(0.984) | 6.526***<br>(0.692) |
| $CBAN_{-1}$             | 0.089<br>(0.104)                              | 0.042<br>(0.122)        | 0.089<br>(0.248)    | -0.098<br>(0.287)   |
| Relevant Statistics     |   |                         |                     |                     |
| $BIC$                   | 629.98  | 373.15                  | 87.39               | 101.43              |
| Fixed Effects           |   |                         |                     |                     |
| Country                 | Yes   | Yes                     | Yes                 | Yes                 |
| <i>No. Observations</i> | 1,715   | 980                     | 245                 | 245                 |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from a dynamic logit model with a lagged binary variable for a panel of 13 countries at the monthly frequency over the period of 1999 – 2019 with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. Using generalized linear model (GLM), the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) is applied so that standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. The full reproducible code is available on CRAN. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

**Table 10:** Estimation of the clustering panel – Monthly frequency – 1999-2019

| Groups                    | Group 1                | Group 2               | Group 3                 | Group 4               |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                           | BEL                    | AUS                   | FRA                     | CHE                   |
|                           | CAN                    | DEU                   | ITA                     |                       |
|                           | JPN                    | NZL                   |                         |                       |
|                           | NLD                    | UK                    |                         |                       |
|                           | SWE                    |                       |                         |                       |
|                           | USA                    |                       |                         |                       |
| <i>YSPR</i> <sub>-1</sub> | -0.4274***<br>(0.0800) | -0.0662<br>(0.1018)   | -0.5641***<br>(0.1168)  | -0.2851<br>(0.5386)   |
| <i>CBAN</i> <sub>-1</sub> | 0.1536<br>(0.0938)     | 0.0449<br>(0.0313)    | -0.0364<br>(0.1916)     | -0.1120<br>(0.2841)   |
| <i>REC</i> <sub>-1</sub>  | 6.6000***<br>(0.1366)  | 6.3589***<br>(0.1021) | 6.6098***<br>(0.0.3330) | 6.4305***<br>(0.6954) |
| Fixed Effects             |                        |                       |                         |                       |
| Country                   | Yes                    | Yes                   | Yes                     | Yes                   |
| <i>No. Observations</i>   | 1,470                  | 980                   | 490                     | 245                   |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from a dynamic logit model with a lagged binary variable for a panel of 13 countries at the monthly frequency over the period of 1999 – 2019 with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. Using generalized linear model (GLM), the correction of Driscoll and Kraay (1998) is applied so that standard errors are robust to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020). Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

At the global level, the results in Tables 8, 9 and 10 indicate that the predictive power of the yield spread across our sample of 13 OECD countries is partially homogeneous. Indeed, each statistical cluster analysis reveals that the optimal combinations both consist of four clusters only. Moreover, among clusters of these optimal combinations, 2 clusters include 10 countries (resp 11 countries) out of 13. Next, focusing on our innovative cluster approach, some differences are observed about the relationship between the term spread and future recessions. The lagged yield spread coefficient is significant for 2 clusters only (Group 1: Belgium, Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden and USA; Group 3: France and Italy). Furthermore, the coefficient is smaller for Group 3 than for Group 1, while central banks' rates are not significant in any cluster. As other variables are significant in each cluster, the optimal set of clusters appears to be computed from yield spread coefficients only.

In summary, these results highlight that more than the half of countries have experienced recessions related to a yield spread decrease, and that, at first sight, monetary policy seems

---

of the 13 countries.

to have no role in the short run. Incidentally, countries belonging to the European Monetary Union since 1999 are not grouped in a single cluster. However, we shall approach the conclusions with caution, as central banks' policy rates are only one proxy of monetary policy stance. Investigating further shows that the latter results highlight a distinct feature of monetary policy across clusters. Indeed, the cluster distribution may be related to the monetary policy target and to the use of unconventional monetary policy tools. For instance, Groups 1 and 3 include proportionally few countries that have adopted inflation targeting over the period from 1999 to 2019. In contrast, Group 2 includes a majority of countries that have officially adopted inflation targeting before 1999. Last, we note that countries engaged in some form of quantitative easing (QE) and that have reached the Zero Lower Bound (ZLB) tend to be in the same clusters. These similarities are reported in Table 11.

**Table 11:** Clusters, monetary policy and the yield curve

| Country        | Cluster | Pred. power | Monetary policy target | Date | QE  | Dates |
|----------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|------|-----|-------|
| Belgium        | A       | Yes         | hybrid                 |      | Yes | 2015  |
| Canada         | A       | Yes         | inflation targeting    | 1991 | No  |       |
| Japan          | A       | Yes         | inflation targeting    | 2013 | Yes | 2001  |
| Netherlands    | A       | Yes         | hybrid                 |      | Yes | 2015  |
| Sweden         | A       | Yes         | inflation targeting    | 1993 | Yes | 2015  |
| United States  | A       | Yes         | inflation targeting    | 2012 | Yes | 2008  |
| Australia      | B       | No          | inflation targeting    | 1993 | No  |       |
| Germany        | B       | No          | hybrid                 |      | Yes | 2015  |
| New Zealand    | B       | No          | inflation targeting    | 1990 | No  |       |
| United Kingdom | B       | No          | inflation targeting    | 1992 | Yes | 2009  |
| France         | C       | Yes         | hybrid                 |      | Yes | 2015  |
| Italy          | C       | Yes         | hybrid                 |      | Yes | 2015  |
| Switzerland    | D       | No          | hybrid                 |      | Yes | 2012  |

**Notes:** This table reports the clusters' countries and the associated results for the predictive power of the yield curve, the monetary policy target and date of the last change as well as the Quantitative Easing (QE) and the first launch date. Data on monetary policy targets are from the IMF Annual Report on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Restrictions (2018).

Based on this empirical analysis, we confirm that monitoring the yield curve should be useful for forecasting recessions in most industrialized countries. At the global level, the predictive power of the yield spread is confirmed in a panel dataset covering a period of over 45 years of monthly observations and including 13 OECD countries. Controlling for a set of 8 recession risk factors selected from the empirical literature, the predictive power of the yield spread is also robust to several econometric specifications and time-sampling in the short run (from 1 month to 1 quarter ahead). Investigating the potential homogeneity of the predictive power of the yield spread across countries, we perform a cluster analysis on the results from panel logit regressions. The results indicate that the relationship between the yield spread and the probability of future recession is partially homogeneous. Specifically, we provide empirical evidence that, controlling for central banks' rates, whatever the chosen clustering approach, the yield spread is a useful tool for more than a half of countries. Last, at the global level, central banks' policy rates have no impact on the predictive power of the yield curve, while the results at the cluster level seem to indicate that the predictive power could be related to monetary policy target. These mixed results about the impact of conventional monetary policy on the predictive power of the yield curve are not completely

consistent with the analytical and empirical results of Estrella (2005) and Wright (2006), respectively. However, our results are in line with Chinn and Kucko (2015): we find that the short-term rate parameter is statistically insignificant and the predictive power of the yield spread seems to be impacted by the ZLB. Hence, these results call into question the structural interpretation of the relationship between the term spread and future recession.

#### 4. Conclusions

In this paper, we reexamine the predictive power of the yield curve across countries and over time. Our purpose is to confirm the predictive power of the yield spread and to investigate its homogeneity across countries. In line with Candelon et al. (2014), we adapt the univariate modeling approach of Kauppi and Saikkonen (2008) to a balanced panel framework. We also investigate the homogeneity of the predictive power of the yield spread via an innovative cluster analysis. Specifically, we adapt the clustering methodology of Zhang et al. (2019) for quantile regression to dichotomous models. Indeed, from both econometric and macroeconomic perspectives, investigating the homogeneity of the yield spread's predictive power across countries is crucial to assess its robustness and reliability. Afterwards, we build a unique database to estimate the predictive power of the term spread, controlling for central banks' official rates (Wright, 2006), stock market returns (Nyberg, 2010), housing markets' returns and liquidity spread (Ng, 2012), stock market volatility (VIX) (Adrian et al., 2010), sentiment (Christiansen et al., 2014), economic policy uncertainty (Karnizova and Li, 2014), crude oil market returns (Engemann et al., 2011; Kilian and Vigfusson, 2017) and credit spread (Ponka, 2017). Our results confirm the predictive power of the yield spread in most countries and indicate its partial homogeneity across countries. Our empirical findings, except those for the central bank policy rates, are consistent with the recent literature. Contrary to the analytical and empirical results of Estrella (2005) and Wright (2006), respectively, our findings indicate that central bank policy rates have no impact on the predictive power of the yield curve. However, the mixed results of the cluster analysis indicate that the pre-

dictive power of the term spread could be related to monetary policy frameworks (inflation targeting or alternative policy frameworks), as argued by Estrella (2005) or unconventional monetary policy tools, as argued by Chinn and Kucko (2015). Our results are robust to several econometric specifications, time-sampling and macro-control variables.

In summary, our contribution to the literature is threefold. First, we extend the database of Chinn and Kucko (2015), proposing a unique database including a set of eight country-level recession risk factors, and covering 13 industrialized countries over 45 years at the monthly frequency. Second, we confirm the predictive power of the yield spread in a new balanced panel framework and provide empirical evidence of its partial homogeneity via an innovative cluster analysis. Third, we show that monitoring of the yield curve evolution should be extended to countries other than the US. The impact of unconventional monetary policy on the predictive power of the yield spread appears to be weaker than expected. These empirical findings support a wider use of the yield curve for monitoring business cycles.

## References

- Adrian, T., Estrella, A., and Shin, H. S. (2010). Monetary cycles, financial cycles and the business cycle. *FRB of New York Staff Report*, (421).
- Agresti, A. (2018). *An introduction to categorical data analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ahrens, R. (2002). Predicting recessions with interest rate spreads: a multicountry regime-switching analysis. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 21(4):519–537.
- Ando, T. and Bai, J. (2015a). Asset pricing with a general multifactor structure. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 13(3):556–604.
- Ando, T. and Bai, J. (2015b). A simple new test for slope homogeneity in panel data models with interactive effects. *Economics Letters*, 136:112–117.
- Bai, J. (2009). Panel data models with interactive fixed effects. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 77(4):1229–1279.
- Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., and Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring economic policy uncertainty. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4):1593–1636.
- Bellégo, C. and Ferrara, L. (2009). Forecasting euro-area recessions using time-varying binary response models for financial markets.
- Bernard, H. and Gerlach, S. (1998). Does the term structure predict recessions? the international evidence. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, 3(3):195–215.
- Blomquist, J. and Westerlund, J. (2013). Testing slope homogeneity in large panels with serial correlation. *Economics Letters*, 121(3):374–378.
- Bobasu, A., Comunale, M., Gómez-Salvador, R., Quaglietti, L., et al. (2019). Characterising the current expansion across non-euro area advanced economies: where do we go from here? *Economic Bulletin Boxes*, 2.



- Bry, G. and Boschan, C. (1971). Programmed selection of cyclical turning points. In *Cyclical analysis of time series: Selected procedures and computer programs*, pages 7–63. NBER.
- Candelon, B., Dumitrescu, E.-I., and Hurlin, C. (2012). How to evaluate an early-warning system: Toward a unified statistical framework for assessing financial crises forecasting methods. *IMF Economic Review*, 60(1):75–113.
- Candelon, B., Dumitrescu, E.-I., and Hurlin, C. (2014). Currency crisis early warning systems: Why they should be dynamic. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 30(4):1016–1029.
- Chauvet, M. and Potter, S. (2002). Predicting a recession: evidence from the yield curve in the presence of structural breaks. *Economics Letters*, 77(2):245–253.
- Chauvet, M. and Potter, S. (2005). Forecasting recessions using the yield curve. *Journal of Forecasting*, 24(2):77–103.
- Chinn, M. and Kucko, K. (2015). The predictive power of the yield curve across countries and time. *International Finance*, 18(2):129–156.
- Christiansen, C., Eriksen, J. N., and Møller, S. V. (2014). Forecasting us recessions: The role of sentiment. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 49:459–468.
- Dimand, R. W. and Gomez Betancourt, R. (2012). Retrospectives: Irving fisher’s appreciation and interest (1896) and the fisher relation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(4):185–96.
- Driscoll, J. C. and Kraay, A. C. (1998). Consistent covariance matrix estimation with spatially dependent panel data. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 80(4):549–560.
- Duarte, A., Venetis, I. A., and Paya, I. (2005). Predicting real growth and the probability of recession in the euro area using the yield spread. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 21(2):261–277.

- Dueker, M. J. (1997). Markov switching in garch processes and mean-reverting stock-market volatility. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 15(1):26–34.
- Engemann, K. M., Kliesen, K. L., and Owyang, M. T. (2011). Do oil shocks drive business cycles? some us and international evidence. *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 15(S3):498–517.
- Erdogan, O., Bennett, P., and Ozyildirim, C. (2015). Recession prediction using yield curve and stock market liquidity deviation measures. *Review of Finance*, 19(1):407–422.
- Estrella, A. (2005). Why does the yield curve predict output and inflation? *The Economic Journal*, 115(505):722–744.
- Estrella, A. and Hardouvelis, G. A. (1991). The term structure as a predictor of real economic activity. *The Journal of Finance*, 46(2):555–576.
- Estrella, A. and Mishkin, F. S. (1997). The predictive power of the term structure of interest rates in europe and the united states: Implications for the european central bank. *European Economic Review*, 41(7):1375–1401.
- Estrella, A. and Mishkin, F. S. (1998). Predicting us recessions: Financial variables as leading indicators. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 80(1):45–61.
- Estrella, A., Rodrigues, A. P., and Schich, S. (2003). How stable is the predictive power of the yield curve? evidence from germany and the united states. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(3):629–644.
- Fama, E. F. (1986). Term premiums and default premiums in money markets. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 17(1):175–196.
- Harvey, C. R. (1988). The real term structure and consumption growth. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 22(2):305–333.
- Hasse, J.-B. and Lajaunie, Q. (2020). Ews: Early warning system. *R package version 0.1. 0*.

- Hasse, J.-B. and Lajaunie, Q. (2021). EWS: Early warning system. *R package version 0.2.0*.
- Hausman, J. A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1251–1271.
- Hwang, Y. (2019). Forecasting recessions with time-varying models. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 62:103153.
- Kapetanios, G. (2003). Determining the poolability of individual series in panel datasets. *U of London Queen Mary Economics Working Paper*, (499).
- Karnizova, L. and Li, J. C. (2014). Economic policy uncertainty, financial markets and probability of us recessions. *Economics Letters*, 125(2):261–265.
- Kauppi, H. and Saikkonen, P. (2008). Predicting us recessions with dynamic binary response models. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(4):777–791.
- Kessel, R. A. (1965). The cyclical behavior of the term structure of interest rates. In *Essays on Interest Rates, Volume 2*, pages 337–390. NBER.
- Kilian, L. and Vigfusson, R. J. (2017). The role of oil price shocks in causing us recessions. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 49(8):1747–1776.
- King, T. B., Levin, A. T., and Perli, R. (2007). Financial market perceptions of recession risk.
- Kumar, M., Moorthy, U., and Perraudin, W. (2003). Predicting emerging market currency crashes. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 10(4):427–454.
- Lin, C.-C. and Ng, S. (2012). Estimation of panel data models with parameter heterogeneity when group membership is unknown. *Journal of Econometric Methods*, 1(1):42–55.
- Moneta, F. (2005). Does the yield spread predict recessions in the euro area. *International Finance*, 8(2):263–301.

- Naceur, S. B., Candelon, B., and Lajaunie, Q. (2019). Taming financial development to reduce crises. *Emerging Markets Review*, 40:100618.
- Newey, W. K. and West, K. D. (1987). Hypothesis testing with efficient method of moments estimation. *International Economic Review*, pages 777–787.
- Newey, W. K. and West, K. D. (1994). Automatic lag selection in covariance matrix estimation. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 61(4):631–653.
- Ng, E. C. (2012). Forecasting us recessions with various risk factors and dynamic probit models. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 34(1):112–125.
- Ng, S. and Wright, J. H. (2013). Facts and challenges from the great recession for forecasting and macroeconomic modeling. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 51(4):1120–54.
- Nyberg, H. (2010). Dynamic probit models and financial variables in recession forecasting. *Journal of Forecasting*, 29(1-2):215–230.
- Ozturk, H. and Pereira, L. F. V. (2013). Yield curve as a predictor of recessions: Evidence from panel data. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 49(sup5):194–212.
- Park, B. U., Simar, L., and Zelenyuk, V. (2020). Forecasting of recessions via dynamic probit for time series: replication and extension of kauppi and saikkonen (2008). *Empirical Economics*, 58(1):379–392.
- Pesaran, M. H. and Yamagata, T. (2008). Testing slope homogeneity in large panels. *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(1):50–93.
- Ponka, H. (2017). The role of credit in predicting us recessions. *Journal of Forecasting*, 36(5):469–482.
- RCoreTeam (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

- Rudebusch, G. D. and Williams, J. C. (2009). Forecasting recessions: the puzzle of the enduring power of the yield curve. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 27(4):492–503.
- Sensier, M., Artis, M., Osborn, D. R., and Birchenhall, C. (2004). Domestic and international influences on business cycle regimes in europe. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 20(2):343–357.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2014). Estimating turning points using large data sets. *Journal of Econometrics*, 178:368–381.
- Su, L. and Chen, Q. (2013). Testing homogeneity in panel data models with interactive fixed effects. *Econometric Theory*, pages 1079–1135.
- Van den Berg, J., Candelon, B., and Urbain, J.-P. (2008). A cautious note on the use of panel models to predict financial crises. *Economics Letters*, 101(1):80–83.
- Wheelock, D. C. and Wohar, M. E. (2009). Can the term spread predict output growth and recessions? a survey of the literature. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 91(5 Part 1):419–440.
- Wright, J. H. (2006). The yield curve and predicting recessions.
- Zhang, Y., Wang, H. J., and Zhu, Z. (2019). Quantile-regression-based clustering for panel data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 213(1):54–67.

## Appendix 1 - Clustering panel procedure for dichotomous models

In this appendix, we detail the procedure used to compute logit regression-based clustering for panel data. Our approach is inspired by the method of Zhang et al. (2019) for quantile regression-based clustering for panel data.

For clarity, we restate the dichotomous panel model being considered:

$$P_{t-1}(y_{i,t} = 1) = F(\pi_{i,t}) = F(\beta' x_{i,t-1} + \alpha y_{i,t-1} + \delta \pi_{i,t-1} + \eta_i),$$

for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ , and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,

where  $N$  is the number of countries in the panel,  $P_{t-1}(y_{i,t} = 1)$  is the conditional probability of observing a recession at time  $t$  in country  $i$ , and  $\pi_t$  is the index at time  $t - 1$ .  $F$  is the logistic c.d.f. Variable  $\eta_i$  is a country fixed effect for the control of unobserved heterogeneity and potential bias. We define  $\theta$  as the vector of the estimated coefficients  $[\beta, \alpha^T, \delta^T]^T$ .

The goal of this estimation is twofold: first, to identify the subgroup membership in order to test partial homogeneity of our sample, and second, to obtain accurate estimation of group-specific parameters.

The computation of logit regression-based clustering consists of performing the following steps:

1. Fit a logit regression for each country and estimate the fixed effect  $\eta_i$  by  $\tilde{\eta}_i$  with

$$\text{LogL}(\tilde{\theta}_i, \tilde{\eta}_i) = \sum_{t=1}^T [y_{it} \log(F(\pi_{i,t}(\theta_i, \eta_i))) + (1 - y_{it}) \log(1 - F(\pi_{i,t}(\theta_i, \eta_i)))].$$

2. Consider each country in the sample to be associated with a value from 1 to  $N$ , where  $N$  is the number of countries. Draw a set of data from 1 to  $N$  without replacement, denoted by  $\Omega$ .

3. Take the first value of  $\Omega$ , denoted by  $\Omega_1$ , and create the first group with the associated country. Next, initialize parameters  $\theta_g = \theta_1$  as follows:

$$\text{LogL}(\tilde{\theta}_1) = \sum_{t=1}^T [y_{(\Omega_1,t)} \log(F(\pi_{(\Omega_1,t)}(\theta_1, \tilde{\eta}_{\Omega_1}))) + (1 - y_{(\Omega_1,t)}) \log(1 - F(\pi_{(\Omega_1,t)}(\theta_1, \tilde{\eta}_{\Omega_1})))]$$

4. Iterate and consider each subsequent value  $\Omega_i$  in  $\Omega$  for  $i = 2, \dots, N$  one-by-one. For each value, test the country's membership in the already existing groups by measuring a new  $\theta_g$ , as well as the possibility that the country is in a new group alone. To this end, for each new country being added, take the solution that minimizes the Pearson residuals, proceeding as follows:

For  $i = 2, \dots, N$ :

- (a) Consider the number  $G$  of existing groups. Note that in the beginning, for  $i = 2$ , the number of groups is equal to 1, and the only group contains country  $\Omega_1$ . Add the subsequent country associated with  $\Omega_i$ , and estimate for  $g = 1, \dots, G + 1$  the new  $\theta_g$ :

$$\text{LogL}(\tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^G \sum_{t=1}^T [y_{it} \log(F(\pi_{i,t}(\theta_g, \tilde{\eta}_i))) + (1 - y_{it}) \log(1 - F(\pi_{i,t}(\theta_g, \tilde{\eta}_i)))]$$

- (b) Vector  $\theta$  associated with each group is estimated with a constrained value of  $\tilde{\eta}$ . To allow convergence of the estimators, estimate a new  $\eta_i$  for each country by fixing  $\theta$  based on the last estimated  $\tilde{\theta}$ :

$$\text{LogL}(\tilde{\eta}_i) = \sum_{t=1}^T [y_{i,t} \log(F(\pi_{i,t}(\tilde{\theta}_g, \eta_i))) + (1 - y_{i,t}) \log(1 - F(\pi_{i,t}(\tilde{\theta}_g, \eta_i)))]$$

where country  $i$  belongs to group  $g$ .

- (c) Repeat (a) and (b) a sufficiently large number of times to observe convergence of estimator  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_g$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$  for  $g = 1, \dots, G + 1$  and for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .
- (d) Among  $G + 1$  estimations, select the estimation that minimizes the Pearson residuals:

$$Residual \quad Sum = \underset{g \in [1, G+1]}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{j=1}^g \frac{Y_j - F(\pi_j)}{F(\pi_j)(1 - F(\pi_j))},$$

where *Residual Sum* is the minimum of the sum of Pearson residuals.

5. Repeat items 2-4 for  $s = 1, \dots, S$ , where  $S$  is the total number of simulations. Compare the final *Residual Sum* obtained in 4.(d) for each simulation, and save the value corresponding to the minimum over all simulations.
6. For all groups obtained in steps 1-5, re-estimate  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_g$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$ , the fixed effect of each country that belongs to the associated group  $g$ . A Driscoll and Kraay (1998) correction is implemented to avoid bias due to cross-sectional dependence for all groups.

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{LogL}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_g, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \operatorname{LogL}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_g, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T [y_{it} \log(F(\pi_{i,t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_g, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i))) + (1 - y_{it}) \log(1 - F(\pi_{i,t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_g, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i)))] \end{aligned}$$



## Appendix 2 - Replicating results using alternative recession indicators

This appendix replicates the results displayed in Table 3. Most results reported in this paper are based on OECD recession indicators. However, alternative definitions coexist, such as NBER and ECB recession indicators. Therefore, as a robustness check, our main results are replicated using alternative recession indicators. The results are reported in Tables 12 and 13 and indicate that our main results are robust to alternative recession dummies.

According to NBER, a recession is defined as "*a significant decline in economic activity that is spread across the economy and lasts more than a few months*". NBER recession indicators are extracted from the ECRI database, and the results are reported in Table 12. The results indicate that the main results based on OECD recession indicators are robust to the use of NBER recession dummies.

**Table 12:** Estimation results of panel logit models – Monthly frequency – 1975-2016

| Model                   | (1)                    | (2)                    | (3)                    | (4)                    |
|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| $YSPR_{-1}$             | -0.3329***<br>(0.0565) | -0.3771***<br>(0.0658) | -0.1645***<br>(0.0171) | -0.3641***<br>(0.0647) |
| $REC_{-1}$              |                        | 7.3903***<br>(0.1895)  |                        | 7.3345***<br>(0.4392)  |
| $Index_{-1}$            |                        |                        | -1.0336***<br>(0.1421) | -1.0449***<br>(0.5642) |
| Relevant Statistics     |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| $BIC$                   | 5,172.2                | 1,057.33               | 5,077.4                | 1,066.0                |
| Fixed Effects           |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| Country                 | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    |
| <i>No. Observations</i> | 5,424                  | 5,424                  | 5,424                  | 5,424                  |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from static and dynamic logit models (1)–(4) for a panel of 11 countries covering the period from February 1975 to March 2016 at the monthly frequency with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy extracted from the NBER database for the United States and from the ECRI database for the others. We report Bayesian (BIC) information criteria for each specification. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (R Core Team, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie, 2020) package. The full reproducible code is available on CRAN. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

According to the ECB and the HM Treasury (UK) definition, a recession is defined by "*two or more consecutive quarters of decline in the level of GDP*". This definition, referred to as the Bry-Boschan algorithm (Bry and Boschan, 1971), is also used in the recent literature

(e.g., Stock and Watson, 2014; Bobasu et al., 2019). In this line, we computed this alternative recession indicator based on GDP data provided by the World Bank open dataset. Then, we replicated our main results (see Table 13 below) using this alternative recession indicator.


**Table 13:** Estimation results of panel logit models – Quarterly frequency – 1975-2019






| Model               | (1)                    | (2)                    | (3)                    | (4)                    |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| $YSPR_{-1}$         | -0.2296***<br>(0.0795) | -0.2469***<br>(0.0651) | -0.1927***<br>(0.0200) | -0.2520***<br>(0.0563) |
| $REC_{-1}$          |                        | 3.1627***<br>(0.2010)  |                        | 3.0010<br>(0.2429)     |
| $Index_{-1}$        |                        |                        | -0.4968***<br>(0.1085) | -0.5217<br>(0.4802)    |
| Relevant Statistics |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| $BIC$               | 1135.44                | 919.27                 | 1100.48                | 925.97                 |
| Fixed Effects       |                        |                        |                        |                        |
| Country             | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    | Yes                    |
| $No. Observations$  | 2,112                  | 2,112                  | 2,112                  | 2,112                  |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from static and dynamic logit models (1)–(4) for a panel of 12 countries covering the period from February 1975 to March 2019 at the quarterly frequency with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy built following the Bry and Boschan (1971)’s algorithm. We report Bayesian (BIC) information criteria for each specification. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (R Core Team, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.2.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie (2021) package). The full reproducible code is available on CRAN. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.

## Appendix 3 - The predictive power of the yield spread

Figure 1: The predictive power of the yield curve from 1999 to 2019





**Notes:** This figure plots the yield curves (blue curves), observed and fitted recessions (grey areas and black curves respectively) from 1999 to 2019. Results are estimated using a dynamic logit model. Country-level results indicate that the yield spread signals recessions. Country clusters highlight common features about the predictive power of the yield curve.

## Appendix 4 - Estimations obtained from dynamic logit model (2) for each of the 13 countries

**Table 14:** Estimation results for each country – Monthly frequency – 1999-2019

|           |                          |                      |                |                          |                      |
|-----------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Australia | <i>Intercept</i>         | -3.308***<br>(0.540) | Netherlands    | <i>Intercept</i>         | -2.419***<br>(0.473) |
|           | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.084<br>(0.157)    |                | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.709***<br>(0.213) |
|           | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.460***<br>(0.457)  |                | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.553***<br>(0.504)  |
|           | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.002<br>(0.052)     |                | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.029<br>(0.042)    |
| Belgium   | <i>Intercept</i>         | -4.046***<br>(0.736) | New Zealand    | <i>Intercept</i>         | -3.096***<br>(0.356) |
|           | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.100<br>(0.250)     |                | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.094<br>(0.101)     |
|           | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.411***<br>(0.461)  |                | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.351***<br>(0.451)  |
|           | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.124*<br>(0.074)    |                | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.011<br>(0.088)     |
| Canada    | <i>Intercept</i>         | -2.445***<br>(0.569) | Sweden         | <i>Intercept</i>         | -4.297***<br>(0.708) |
|           | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.564***<br>(0.200) |                | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.328**<br>(0.167)  |
|           | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.207***<br>(0.454)  |                | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.667***<br>(0.524)  |
|           | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.062<br>(0.062)    |                | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.300**<br>(0.125)   |
| France    | <i>Intercept</i>         | -2.239***<br>(0.674) | Switzerland    | <i>Intercept</i>         | -2.790***<br>(0.524) |
|           | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.775***<br>(0.252) |                | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.398**<br>(0.167)  |
|           | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.592***<br>(0.508)  |                | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.385***<br>(0.465)  |
|           | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.075<br>(0.145)    |                | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.03<br>(0.045)     |
| Germany   | <i>Intercept</i>         | -2.475***<br>(0.608) | United Kingdom | <i>Intercept</i>         | -3.148***<br>(0.477) |
|           | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.671***<br>(0.234) |                | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.436***<br>(0.169) |
|           | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.369***<br>(0.480)  |                | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.486***<br>(0.492)  |
|           | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.023<br>(0.101)    |                | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.007<br>(0.059)    |
| Italy     | <i>Intercept</i>         | -3.328***<br>(0.556) | United States  | <i>Intercept</i>         | -2.968***<br>(0.642) |
|           | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.174***<br>(0.156) |                | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | -0.497**<br>(0.242)  |
|           | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.453***<br>(0.465)  |                | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.755***<br>(0.519)  |
|           | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.017<br>(0.068)     |                | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.085<br>(0.074)     |
| Japan     | <i>Intercept</i>         | -3.502***<br>(0.575) |                |                          |                      |
|           | <i>YSPR</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.166<br>(0.241)     |                |                          |                      |
|           | <i>REC</i> <sub>1</sub>  | 6.314***<br>(0.455)  |                |                          |                      |
|           | <i>CBAN</i> <sub>1</sub> | 0.009<br>(0.050)     |                |                          |                      |

**Notes:** This table reports the estimates obtained from dynamic logit model (2) for each of the 13 countries in the panel covering the period from January 1999 to March 2019 at the monthly frequency with one lag. The dependent variable is the recession dummy. Results are computed using R 3.6.0 (RCoreTeam, 2020) and the *ews* (*v0.1.0*; Hasse and Lajaunie 2020) package. The full reproducible code is available on CRAN. Standard errors are reported in parentheses below the estimates. Labels \*\*\*, \*\* and \* indicate significance at 99%, 95% and 90% levels, respectively.