Applied Financial Economics ›
Volume 16, 2006 - Issue 7

Original Articles

Testing purchasing power parity hypothesis for transition economies

Ebru Guven Solakoglu

Pages 561-568 | Published online: 19 Aug 2006

Cite this article https://doi.org/10.1080/09603100500426531

Abstra

This stu el approach. The resu ife converg rates for ‘less ope ’ transition econo

Notes

[1] EBRD,

[2] Also se

[3] Note that the results we get from this exercise would neither be meaningful nor powerful since the period in question is 12 unbalanced years.

[4] Levin and Lin (1993) indicated from simulation exercises that the problem of limited power in unit root tests is severe for small samples: 'For example, if 50 observations are generated by a stationary univariate model with first-order autocorrelation of 0.9, the augmented Dickey–Fuller (Dickey and Fuller, 1981) test procedure (allowing for intercept and time trend, and using a 5 percent confidence level) rejects the unit root hypothesis in only 8 percent of the replications.'

[5] If a deterministic element like an intercept and/or a time trend is present in the data but not included in the model, the unit root test will be inconsistent (Levin and Lin, 1992).

[6] As most of the univariate tests for transition countries suggested, an augmented Dickey–Fuller (ADF) test is conducted for one lag ($k = 1$).

[7] The Im, Pesaran and Shin test procedure estimates each equation separately by OLS as in univariate tests, and test statistics are obtained by taking the averages of ADF t-statistics for each equation. In addition, Im, Pesaran and Shin perform the LM test, which is based on the standardized cross section average of the individual LM statistics in their 1

est and LM test ove

better than the LM t

[8] Nickell

, where, A_T $= -(1 +$

$1 - \rho)(T -$ 1)].

[9] Karlsso

$= 10$, two LL tests

in and Lin test (LL2

results, we can focu

le ($T = 12$, N $= 21$). Se

evin and Lin tests, an

h the Fisher test. Als

s. Also see Im, Pesa

th t and LM tests for

[10] Note that some studies argue that rejection of unit root by a single country is enough to reject the unit root for the whole panel. Although time series for this study is too short to further discuss the unit root statistics for each country, we conducted a panel test on countries for which we do not reject a unit root, and obtained similar results to those above.

[11] Wu (1996) found the speed at which real exchange rates restore to equilibrium taking approximately two and a half years for one-time deviation from parity to be reduced by a half while supporting the long-run PPP for eighteen counties during the post-Bretton Woods period. Frankel and Rose (1996) found this speed to take approximately four years for a panel of 150 countries for a longer and unbalanced period (from 1948 to 1992).

[12] Score definitions are detailed under EBRD, annual transition reports, Section II.

[13] Note that report adds another level of score described with a plus and minus signs to all categories. Plus and minus signs are treated by adding 0.3 and subtracting 0.3 from the full value. Therefore the highest score for an element would be 4.3, totalling to 12.9 for three elements.

[14] Notice that Bulgaria with a score of 10.9 is at the margin. Also note that it is an acceding test placing Bulgaria ntly.

[15] The da estimated the data using the truncate

[16] Note t t in the first and sec orted the resu in this section.

Source: Informa UK Limited

PURCHASING POWER PARITY IN LESS-DEVELOPED AND TRANSITION ECONOMIES: A REVIEW PAPER

Source: Wiley

Related research