



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Cointegration tests of purchasing power parity

Wallace, Frederick

Universidad de Quintana Roo

1 October 2009

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/24966/>

MPRA Paper No. 24966, posted 14 Sep 2010 11:51 UTC

Cointegration Tests of Purchasing Power Parity

Frederick H. Wallace
Professor, CENTRUM Católica
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú
Jr. Daniel Alomía Robles 125
Urbanización Los Álamos de Monterrico - Surco
Lima, Perú

E-mail: fwallace@pucp.edu.pe

Revised
August, 2010

I thank Alan Taylor for providing the data used in his study. Walt Enders kindly provided computer code, recent versions of his working papers cited herein, and helpful comments on an earlier version of the paper. Gary Shelley made a number of useful suggestions as well. Errors are mine, of course. Financial support from the National Council for Science and Technology (CONACYT) of Mexico is gratefully acknowledged.

Abstract: Cointegration Tests of Purchasing Power Parity

JEL Codes: C22, F31

Keywords: Cointegration, purchasing power parity

Running Head: Cointegration Tests of PPP

Im, Lee, and Enders (2008) use stationary instrumental variables in tests for cointegrating relationships. Consequently, the t-statistics are asymptotically standard normal so that the critical values of the normal distribution may be used to assess significance and the nuisance parameter problem is avoided. Using an updated version of the Taylor (2002) data set, the ILE approach is applied to three well-known single equation alternatives in testing for purchasing power parity. The regressions with instruments provide evidence of PPP for some countries but the empirical results differ across tests and, sometimes, with the choice of instrument.

Introduction

The hypothesis of purchasing power parity (PPP) has been the focus of much empirical work. Simply stated, PPP says that the price of a market basket of (traded) goods is the same everywhere in terms of a common currency. The concept is important because theories in open economy macroeconomics imply PPP as a long run equilibrium condition. A partial list of techniques used in such empirical work includes single equation unit root tests, cointegration studies, and panel unit root tests. Some of these methodologies have been adapted for use as nonlinear procedures. Underlying the PPP hypothesis is the law of one price (LOOP), which indicates that the price of a (traded) good is the same in all locations in terms of a common currency. Rather than focus directly on PPP, numerous studies have examined the LOOP with the idea that support for the law of one price suggests support for PPP. Sarno and Taylor (2002) provide a thorough review of the PPP and LOOP literature.

The purpose of this paper is to compare the results from standard, single equation cointegration tests of purchasing power parity with those from an alternative approach recently developed by Im, Lee, and Enders (2006), henceforth ILE. Tests are carried out using the data set on nominal exchange rates and price levels containing 100+ annual observations for twenty countries constructed by Taylor (2002) and updated to 2007.¹ Applying the Elliot, Rothenberg, and Stock (ERS, 1996) unit root test to transformed (demeaned or detrended) real exchange rate data, Taylor finds support for PPP with respect to the US dollar in eighteen of nineteen series. Only data for Japan fail to indicate PPP for either transformed series. When purchasing power parity is tested on real exchange rates with respect to a world market basket, Taylor finds evidence in favor of the hypothesis using demeaned or detrended data in nineteen of the twenty

¹ A list of countries and periods of coverage are provided in Appendix A. Data for Argentina are only available to 2006. The Taylor data also include information for three additional countries (Chile, Greece, and New Zealand) for shorter periods of coverage and not reported in Taylor (2002). Data for these three countries is included in this study.

series. Data for Canada fail to reveal any support for PPP. Lopez, Murray, and Papell (2005) argue that Taylor's strong affirmation of PPP can be attributed to the selection of suboptimal lag length in his unit root tests. Employing optimal lag length selection criteria, they conclude that the data support PPP with respect to the US in just nine of sixteen countries.² Instead of relying on unit root tests, Wallace and Shelley (2006) apply the Fisher-Seater test with bootstrapped errors to the Taylor data and conclude that PPP holds for at least twelve of nineteen countries with respect to the dollar. Various other studies of PPP have been undertaken using the Taylor data.

Methodology

The well-known single equation tests for cointegration have asymptotic distributions which are not standard normal and which may depend on an unknown nuisance parameter. Pesavento (2004, 2007) evaluates the power of various cointegration tests and shows that test power is dependent on the value of a nuisance parameter, the correlation between the errors of the cointegrating relationship and the right hand side variables. In her study of residual-based tests, she finds that power is low in all tests when the nuisance parameter is large. Im, Lee, and Enders offer an intuitively appealing solution to the nuisance parameter problem by employing stationary variables as instruments in three well-known, single equation cointegration tests. With stationary instrumental variables there are no nuisance parameters and the asymptotic distributions of the test statistics are standard normal. In applying their methodology to money demand in the United Kingdom, they find that the results are robust to the choice of instrument. Using a similar IV approach Enders et. al. (2008) test for threshold cointegration in a nonlinear Taylor rule. A brief description of the ILE

² They eliminate Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico from their study. Their data are updated to 1998.

methodology, using their notation, is provided below. For more detailed treatment see their working paper.

Starting with a VAR(p) model in which the variables are cointegrated, ILE derive a vector error correction model (VECM) of the form given by equation (1)

$$\Delta y_{1t} = (d_{11} + d_{12}t) + \delta_1 z_{t-1} + \phi \Delta y_{2t} + C_{11} \Delta y_{1t-1} + C_{12} \Delta y_{2t-1} + v_t \quad (1)$$

where y_{it} , $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$, $i = 1, 2$, are I(1) processes, the d_t are deterministic terms,

$z_{t-1} = y_{1t-1} - \beta y_{2t-1}$, and v_t is a linear combination of the normally distributed and

independent errors of the original VAR.³ The VECM derived from the original VAR

reduces to a single equation if y_{2t} is weakly exogenous as will be assumed in the

empirical work of this study. The null (of no cointegration) and alternative hypotheses

are given by

$$H_0: \delta_1 = 0 \quad H_1: \delta_1 < 0.$$

Alternatively, the error correction model (ECM) can be rewritten as the autoregressive distributed lag (ADL) in equation (2)

$$\Delta y_{1t} = (d_{11} + d_{12}t) + \delta_1 y_{1t-1} + \gamma y_{2t-1} + \phi \Delta y_{2t} + C_{11} \Delta y_{1t-1} + C_{12} \Delta y_{2t-1} + v_t \quad (2)$$

with the same null and alternative as the ECM test where $\gamma = -\delta_1 \beta$.

The Engle-Granger (EG) test is a two-step procedure whereby i) y_{1t} is regressed on y_{2t} using ordinary least squares and ii) the estimated residuals are tested for a unit root as in equation (3),

$$\Delta(y_{1t} - \hat{\beta} y_{2t}) = \delta_1 (y_{1t-1} - \hat{\beta} y_{2t-1}) + C(L) \Delta(y_{1t} - \hat{\beta} y_{2t}) + u_t \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\beta}$ is the estimated vector of parameters from $y_{1t} = (d_{11} + d_{12}t) + \hat{\beta} y_{2t} + \zeta_t$, with

d_{11} as an constant, t as an time trend, and the $C(L) \Delta(y_{1t} - \hat{\beta} y_{2t})$ are lags of the estimated

residuals. The null and alternative hypotheses are

³ ILE assume normality of the errors for convenience and note that the assumption does not affect the asymptotic results.

$$H_0 : \delta_1 = 0 \quad H_1 : \delta_1 < 0$$

In all three tests, δ_1 has a nonstandard distribution under the null.

ILE suggest estimating the three single equation cointegration tests using the instrument w_t defined as:

- $w_t = z_{t-1} - z_{t-m-1}$ for z_{t-1} in (1)
- $w_t = [(y_{1t-1} - y_{1t-m-1}), (y_{2t-1} - y_{2t-m-1})]$ for (y_{1t-1}, y_{2t-1}) in (2)
- $w_t = (y_{1t-1} - \hat{\beta}y_{2t-1}) - (y_{1t-m-1} - \hat{\beta}y_{2t-m-1})$ for $y_{1t-1} - \hat{\beta}y_{2t-1}$ in (3)

with $m \ll T$. A constant with or without trend may be added to each equation. ILE show that the t statistic for $\delta_1 = 0$ (t_{ECM} , t_{ADL} , or t_{EG}) in the equation with instruments has a standard normal distribution for a variety of specifications provided any other nonstationary variables are instrumented. Furthermore, they note that the estimated coefficient $\hat{\delta}_{1i}$ ($\hat{\delta}_{1ECM}$, $\hat{\delta}_{1ADL}$, or $\hat{\delta}_{1EG}$) is consistent.⁴

An unresolved issue in their tests concerns the optimal selection of m . Neither theory nor their empirical work offers a resolution. In simulations they explore the use of different values of m and in an application of their methodology to money demand in the United Kingdom, they find that the results are robust to alternative values of m . In the related paper Enders et. al. (2008) suggest selecting the value of m that minimizes the sum of the squared residuals.

Data and Empirical Results

The Taylor data set consists of annual observations on nominal exchange rates and price indexes for the twenty-three countries listed in Appendix A. The nominal exchange rate is measured as the price of a US dollar in units of the foreign currency. For each country except Chile, Greece, and New Zealand the data span more than 100 years and end in 2007 (2006 in the case of Argentina).

⁴ See ILE for proofs and more detail.

Since integrated variables are necessary for a cointegrating relationship, a series of unit root tests are applied to the logged nominal exchange rate and logged price level data. Augmented Dickey-Fuller, ERS, and the KPSS [Kwiatkowski et. al. (1992)] tests are used. Two specifications of each test are conducted, one with only a constant and the other with a constant and trend. In the case of the ADF and ERS tests, the Schwarz criterion is used to select lag length. The first two tables in Appendix B display the test statistics for the nominal exchange rate and the price level for each country.

With a few exceptions, the unit root tests on the nominal exchange rates suggest that they are nonstationary. In the case of Norway, the inclusion of a trend in the ADF and ERS tests leads to rejection of the unit root null while a trend in the KPSS test suggests failure to reject the null of stationarity. Since the graph of Norway's nominal exchange rate clearly shows upward movement, albeit with substantial variation, the tests with trend are more likely correctly specified. Thus Norway's nominal rate appears trend stationary. Similarly, results for the ADF and ERS tests with trend for Sweden and Denmark also indicate rejection of the unit root null, although the KPSS tests reject the stationarity null in these two instances. Despite isolated contrary results, the general conclusion for all other countries is that the nominal exchange rates are nonstationary.

Except for Portugal and New Zealand the tests suggest that the price level in each country has (at least) one unit root. In the cases of Portugal and New Zealand the test results are ambiguous. Those inclusive of a trend generally suggest trend stationary price levels in the two countries, those without indicate unit roots.

It should be noted that the PPP cointegration tests could be valid even when either a country's price level or nominal exchange rate, but not both, are stationary or trend stationary.⁵ Specifically, purchasing power parity implies a cointegrating relation

⁵ Except for the US price level, which must be integrated since the dollar is the numeraire currency.

between the logs of the dollar denominated price level and the US price level, as shown in equation (4)

$$f_t = p_t^F - e_t = \alpha + \beta p_t^{US} \quad (4)$$

where e_t is the log of the price of a US dollar in terms of the foreign currency, p_t^{US} is the log price level in the United States, p_t^F is the log foreign price level, while f_t is the dollar denominated foreign price level. The dollar denominated price level will be a unit root process if one of its components has a unit root even if the other is stationary or trend stationary. Indeed, the tests, shown in Table B-3 of the appendix, indicate that the dollar-denominated price level has at least one unit root for each of the five countries in which the previous unit root tests did not clearly indicate that either the nominal exchange rate or the price level was an integrated process.

To determine whether a second unit root is present in the data, the same series of tests (ADF, ERS, KPSS with and without trend) are applied to the first differences of the logs of the nominal exchange rate, price level, and dollar-denominated price level for each country (Tables B-4 to B-6 of the appendix). For all countries the results suggest the first difference of the log exchange rate is stationary, thus all nominal exchange rates are I(1) processes.

For most countries the first difference of the logged price level also appears stationary, thus the price level generally appears integrated of order one as well. France, Portugal, Spain, Greece, and New Zealand are exceptions. In the first three cases, the results of tests for a second unit root in the price levels are ambiguous. The results also suggest that the Greece and New Zealand have unit roots in their first differenced price levels. For Greece, this clearly suggests that the logged price level has (at least) two unit roots. But since the tests are ambiguous regarding a unit root in New Zealand's price level, the results should be considered inconclusive regarding a second unit root.

Finally, for the five countries with either uncertain results or indications of a second unit root in the price level, the first difference of the dollar-denominated price level is stationary for France, Spain, and New Zealand while results are inconclusive for Greece and Portugal.

Given the unit root tests results, the dollar-denominated price levels appear to be I(1) for all countries except Greece and Portugal. Consequently, the cointegration tests are not applied to data for Greece and Portugal, leaving the bilateral exchange rate series for twenty countries with respect to the U.S. dollar in the data set. Despite the confusing results concerning the degree of integration of the price level in New Zealand, the cointegration tests for PPP are applied to data for this country, although, the findings ought to be interpreted with some caution in light of the ambiguous results from unit root tests. For convenience, all test conclusions are summarized in Table B-7.

Absolute purchasing power parity implies the coefficient restrictions $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = 1$ in equation (4) but due to the use of price indices rather than actual measures of the cost of a common market basket, equation (4) with these restrictions rarely holds. But the basis of cointegration tests is that PPP implies the existence of a cointegrating relation between f_t and p_t^{US} . The ECM, ADL, and EG cointegration tests for purchasing power parity, equations (1)-(3), can be rewritten as equations (5)-(7), respectively.⁶

$$\Delta f_t = d_{11} + \delta_1 (f_{t-1} - \alpha - \beta p_{t-1}^{US}) + \phi \Delta p_t^{US} + v_t \quad (5)$$

The expression in parentheses in equation (5) is the error, lagged one period, from the estimation of equation (4), that is, the error correction term. Again the US price level, p_t^{US} , is assumed to be weakly exogenous.

The ADL form of the model is

⁶ Since the PPP relationship does not include a deterministic time trend; t is omitted from the empirical models.

$$\Delta f_t = d_{11} + \delta_1 f_{t-1} + \gamma p_{t-1}^{US} + \phi \Delta p_t^{US} + v_t \quad (6)$$

where $d'_{11} = d_{11} - \delta_1 a$ and $\gamma = -\delta_1 \beta$. For the ECM and ADL versions, the same null and alternative apply,

$$H_0: \delta_I = 0 \quad H_1: \delta_I < 0.$$

Failure to reject the null suggests the absence of a cointegrating relation between the US price level and the foreign dollar denominated price level thus implies that PPP does not hold. Lagged values of Δf_t and/or Δp_t^{US} are added to equations (5) and (6) as needed to address serial correlation. Finally the Engle-Granger two-step procedure involves testing for a unit root in the estimated residuals from the empirical counterpart of the PPP relation given by equation (4).

$$\Delta(f_t - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} p_t^{US}) = \delta_1 (f_{t-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} p_{t-1}^{US}) + \sum_{i=1}^j \phi_i \Delta(f_{t-i} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} p_{t-i}^{US}) + u_t \quad (7)$$

Each of the single equation empirical models given by (5)-(7) is estimated and the results compared to estimations using the instrumental variables w_t where

- $w_t = (f_{t-1} - \alpha - \beta' p_{t-1}^{US}) - (f_{t-m-1} - \alpha - \beta' p_{t-m-1}^{US})$ for $f_{t-1} - \alpha - \beta' p_{t-1}^{US}$ in (5)
- $(w_{1t}, w_{2t}) = [(f_{t-1} - f_{t-m-1}), (p_{t-1}^{US} - p_{t-m-1}^{US})]$ for (f_{t-1}, p_{t-1}^{US}) in (6)
- $w_t = (f_{t-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}' p_{t-1}^{US}) - (f_{t-m-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}' p_{t-m-1}^{US})$ for $(f_{t-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}' p_{t-1}^{US})$ in (7)

Breusch-Godfrey Lagrange multiplier (LM) tests for serial correlation are applied to the initial estimation of the error correction model, equation (5). Results for sixteen of the countries show evidence of serial correlation as the p values on the obs*R² statistics are all less than 15%. Up to 4 lags of the dependent variable are added to the ECM specification if the marginal significance level for the obs*R² stat is .15 or less. Lags are added until the marginal significance level exceeds .15. In a few cases serial correlation persists even with 4 lags of Δf_t . In such instances, one lag of Δp_t^{US} is added

to the ECM specifications with 0-4 lags of Δf_t until the LM test produces a p value exceeding .15. One of these two approaches successfully eliminates serial correlation in the ECM for each country (see Table 1). Of interest is how results from the tests with instrumental variables compare to those from the standard specifications. Consequently, the same number of lags used to eliminate autocorrelation in the basic ECM is used in estimations with instrumental variables.

Furthermore, the sample period for each cointegration test for a country, regardless of m , is restricted to be the same as that possible for $m = 12$. For example, for Australia there are data for 1870-2007. To calculate the appropriate instrument when $m = 12$, the first twelve observations are lost so that the estimation period is 1882-2007. All other specifications for Australia are estimated over this restricted sample, 1882-2007, so that the results are comparable for different values of m and for the different models.⁷

Estimated values of δ_1 and associated t-statistics from the error correction model and the ECM variants estimated with instrumental variables are shown in Table 2. Marginal significance levels and critical values for the ECM estimations are determined using the response surfaces in Ericsson and MacKinnon (2002), implemented in the program ECMtest.xls (version 1.0). As mentioned previously, Im Lee and Enders show that the t-statistic on δ_1 in all three versions of the cointegration tests is asymptotically normal so that the critical value of -1.645 (5% level in a one-tailed test) may be used to assess significance. The estimation results suggest moderate support for purchasing power parity, half of the countries display estimated coefficients on the error correction term (column 2) that are significant at the 5% level or better. Conclusions from

⁷ Results from applying the three standard cointegration tests to the updated Taylor data were originally reported in Wallace, Lozano-Cortés, and Cabrera-Castellanos (2008), henceforth WLC. The standard test results reported in this paper are for the restricted sample period thus differ somewhat from those in WLC.

equations estimated with instruments are similar with eleven countries having significant coefficients in at least six of the nine specifications using instruments. NA appears in the table, in some cases, because the model with IV is highly collinear when m is small and multiple lags of Δf_t and/or Δp_t^{US} are included. The results of the IV estimations sometimes vary with the choice of m suggesting some sensitivity to the selection of the instrument. Indeed, in just four instances a significant coefficient on the instrumented variable occurs in all of the IV specifications. Examining the results from the regression that minimize the sum of the squared residuals (SSR) reveals that the coefficient on the instrumented variable is significant in twelve cases.⁸ The particular value of m that minimizes the SSR shows no apparent pattern; in four instances the IV with $m = 6$ minimizes the SSR while in 4 other cases the IV with $m = 11$ does so.

Table 1-Lags and Variables Included to Eliminate Serial Correlation in the Error Correction Model

Country	Lags of Δf_t	Lags of Δp_t^{US}	p value of LM test in final specification
Argentina	0	0	.436
Australia	0	0	.283
Belgium	1	0	.174
Brazil	4	0	.175
Canada	3	1	.182
Chile	0	0	.527
Denmark	1	0	.518
Finland	1	0	.377
France	1	0	.323
Germany	0	0	.855
Italy	2	0	.316
Japan	1	0	.250
Mexico	1	0	.288
Netherlands	1	1	.743
New Zealand	1	0	.452
Norway	1	1	.827
Spain	1	1	.727
Sweden	2	0	.179
Switzerland	2	0	.174
UK	4	0	.337

⁸ The coefficient from the regression having the minimum sum of squared residuals is italicized in bold font in all tables showing coefficient estimates, i.e. Tables 2, 4, and 5.

Table 2 Estimated δ_1 in Error Correction Model, Without and With Instruments

Country	Error Correction	Instrumental Variable								
		m = 4	m = 5	m = 6	m = 7	m = 8	m = 9	m = 10	m = 11	m = 12
Argentina	-0.364*	-0.465*	-0.449*	-0.370*	-0.175	-0.163	-0.239*	-0.313*	-0.353*	-0.400*
t-stat	-4.889	-4.134	-3.886	-3.203	-1.521	-1.571	-2.551	-3.448	-3.842	-4.234
Australia	-0.148	-0.140	-0.206*	-0.172	-0.139	-0.151	-0.126	-0.148	-0.162	-0.132
t-stat	-2.357	-1.059	-1.664	-1.421	-1.174	-1.303	-1.098	-1.318	-1.460	-1.204
Belgium	-0.481*	-0.481*	-0.406*	-0.349*	-0.306*	-0.321*	-0.299*	-0.331*	-0.357*	-0.325*
t-stat	-5.285	-2.298	-2.431	-2.437	-2.262	-2.354	-2.149	-2.429	-2.634	-2.147
Brazil	-0.171	NA	-0.275	-0.207	-0.253*	-0.186*	-0.171*	-0.152*	-0.104	-0.115
t-stat	-3.108	--	-1.555	-1.547	-2.217	-1.777	-1.811	-1.733	-1.253	-1.451
Canada	-0.217*	-0.003	-0.099	-0.124	-0.099	-0.075	-0.143*	-0.197*	-0.221*	-0.269*
t-stat	-3.823	-0.027	-1.060	-1.479	-1.254	-0.990	-1.997	-2.810	-3.154	-3.723
Chile	-0.281*	-0.261*	-0.258*	-0.178	-0.239*	-0.294*	-0.303*	-0.327*	-0.270*	-0.307*
t-stat	-3.534	-2.061	-2.197	-1.572	-2.225	-2.766	-2.800	-2.977	-2.406	-2.765
Denmark	-0.183*	-0.091	-0.132	-0.220*	-0.219*	-0.191*	-0.168*	-0.177*	-0.181*	-0.157*
t-stat	-3.413	-0.953	-1.534	-2.718	-2.722	-2.327	-2.016	-2.152	-2.236	-1.957
Finland	-0.599*	-0.612*	-0.530*	-0.550*	-0.587*	-0.611*	-0.650*	-0.597*	-0.597*	-0.598*
t-stat	-7.746	-4.877	-4.422	-4.629	-4.876	-4.952	-5.164	-4.673	-4.583	-4.637
France	-0.196	-0.240*	-0.302*	-0.299*	-0.257*	-0.239*	-0.258*	-0.371*	-0.326*	-0.082
t-stat	-3.121	-1.726	-2.364	-2.343	-1.956	-1.737	-1.833	-2.597	-2.292	-0.542
Germany	-0.169*	-0.050	-0.081	-0.105	-0.137*	-0.176*	-0.183*	-0.184*	-0.174*	-0.168*
t-stat	-3.295	-0.561	-1.011	-1.406	-1.924	-2.544	-2.692	-2.717	-2.547	-2.444
Italy	-0.200	-0.202	-0.222*	-0.237*	-0.238*	-0.219*	-0.169*	-0.171*	-0.100	-0.078
t-stat	-3.139	-1.471	-2.029	-2.397	-2.502	-2.309	-1.778	-1.823	-1.063	-0.838
Japan	-0.219*	-0.259*	-0.196*	-0.196*	-0.138*	-0.149*	-0.154*	-0.146*	-0.144*	-0.153*
t-stat	-4.494	-3.102	-2.617	-2.617	-1.940	-2.136	-2.258	-2.198	-2.229	-2.382
Mexico	-0.589*	-0.546*	-0.485*	-0.585*	-0.606*	-0.575*	-0.529*	-0.562*	-0.583*	-0.567*
t-stat	-6.353	-3.761	-3.412	-4.346	-4.532	-4.183	-3.798	-4.140	-4.378	-4.256
Netherlands	-0.100	-0.089	-0.067	-0.097	-0.061	-0.051	-0.026	-0.053	-0.070	-0.035
t-stat	-2.256	-0.893	-0.765	-1.237	-0.817	-0.698	-0.361	-0.795	-1.081	-0.555
New	-0.426*	-0.313*	-0.347*	-0.450*	-0.441*	-0.372*	-0.177	-0.245	-0.374*	-0.446*
t-stat	-3.741	-2.212	-2.568	-3.356	-3.138	-2.354	-0.994	-1.581	-2.802	-3.471
Norway	-0.133	-0.081	-0.140	-0.162*	-0.171*	-0.151*	-0.106	-0.103	-0.085	-0.077
t-stat	-2.768	-0.721	-1.497	-1.924	-2.087	-1.812	-1.232	-1.179	-0.981	-0.893
Spain	-0.096	-0.172	-0.183*	-0.206*	-0.202*	-0.210*	-0.118	-0.106	-0.080	-0.055
t-stat	-2.341	-1.482	-1.753	-2.057	-2.047	-2.108	-1.203	-1.100	-0.880	-0.635
Sweden	-0.186	0.221	0.030	-0.051	-0.068	-0.107	-0.093	-0.135	-0.153	-0.114
t-stat	-2.663	0.888	0.205	-0.435	-0.631	-1.061	-0.930	-1.384	-1.550	-1.120
Switzerland	-0.108	0.164	0.018	-0.075	-0.074	-0.036	-0.002	-0.047	-0.049	-0.024
t-stat	-1.877	0.952	0.150	-0.769	-0.815	-0.398	-0.020	-0.558	-0.587	-0.285
UK	-0.118	NA	0.034	-0.058	-0.106	-0.034	-0.043	-0.057	-0.044	-0.051
t-stat	-2.102	--	0.224	-0.434	-0.863	-0.293	-0.386	-0.541	-0.430	-0.537

*significant at the 5% level. The italicized coefficient in bold font for each country is from the equation that minimizes the sum of the squared residuals among the estimations with instruments.

NA-not applicable due to the number of lags in the IV estimation.

$$\Delta f_t = d_{11} + \delta_1 (f_{t-1} - \alpha - \beta' p_{t-1}^{US}) + \phi \Delta p_t^{US} + v_t \quad \text{Without instrument}$$

$$w_t = (f_{t-1} - \alpha - \beta' p_{t-1}^{US}) - (f_{t-m-1} - \alpha - \beta' p_{t-m-1}^{US}) \quad \text{Instrument}$$

The error correction model of equation (5) can be rewritten as the autoregressive distributed lag (ADL) model of equation (6). As with the error correction model, there are indications of serial correlation in the initial estimations. The same procedure used to eliminate autocorrelation from the ECM specifications is followed. Not surprisingly, given the derivation of the ADL form from the error correction model, the number of lags of Δf_t and/or Δp_t^{US} needed to eliminate serial correlation is the same for most countries (see Table 3).

Table 3-Lags and Variables Included to Eliminate Serial Correlation in the Autoregressive Distributed Lag Model

Country	Lags of Δf_t	Lags of Δp_t^{US}	p value of LM test in final specification
Argentina	0	0	.440
Australia	0	0	.299
Belgium	1	0	.210
Brazil	4	0	.164
Canada	2	1	.184
Chile	0	0	.527
Denmark	1	0	.521
Finland	1	0	.604
France	1	0	.216
Germany	0	0	.881
Italy	2	0	.295
Japan	1	0	.162
Mexico	1	0	.297
Netherlands	0	1	.156
New Zealand	1	0	.425
Norway	1	1	.804
Spain	0	1	.155
Sweden	1	0	.175
Switzerland	2	0	.172
UK	4	0	.372

Table 4 shows the estimated coefficient $\hat{\delta}_1$ and t-statistic on the lagged value of the country's dollar-denominated price level. Generally, the results are similar to the ECM estimations. The ten countries with significant coefficients on the error correction term in the standard specification plus Sweden also have significant coefficients in the ADL model. In the ADL versions using the instrument the $\hat{\delta}_1$ are significant for twelve countries in at least six of the nine IV specifications. Eleven of these twelve are the

same as in the ECM model with instruments. Sweden is the only country for which results are distinctly different in the ECM and ADL models with instruments. In the estimations for the error correction model with instruments, there is not a single significant coefficient among the 9 different IV estimations for Sweden while in the ADL version with instruments, the instrumented variable has a significant coefficient for every value of $m = 4 \dots 12$.

Again, it is disconcerting to find results dependent on the value of m . When considering just the results from the IV specification that minimizes the sum of the squared residuals, there is more support for PPP. Fourteen of the twenty countries display significant coefficients in the IV estimation that minimizes the SSR. In contrast to the ECM results the IV specifications with a large value of m tends to minimize the SSR. In seven instances $m = 11$ minimizes the SSR and in 4 other cases, the IV estimation with $m = 12$ does so. More positively, the different results when using different instruments may indicate that the IV test for cointegration has low power when a suboptimal instrument is used, at least when applied to the Taylor data. It appears that additional work is needed to establish criteria for the optimal selection of m in the ILE test.

Taken together, the ECM and ADL results suggest modest support for PPP over the sample. When using the standard specifications there is evidence of PPP for more than half the countries. When using instruments two criteria are considered for each country in evaluating the PPP evidence; i) the result from the equation that minimizes the SSR and ii) whether at least six of the (usually) nine IV estimations have significant coefficients, thus are supportive of PPP. By these two criteria, between eleven and fourteen countries display evidence of purchasing power parity.

Table 4-Estimated δ_1 in ADL Model, Without and With Instruments

Country	ADL Model	Instrumental Variable								
		m = 4	m = 5	m = 6	m = 7	m = 8	m = 9	m = 10	m = 11	m = 12
Argentina	-0.365*	-0.503*	-0.474*	-0.385*	-0.183	-0.164	-0.236*	-0.307*	-0.343*	-0.383*
t-stat	-4.881	-4.065	-3.839	-3.183	-1.534	-1.529	-2.418	-3.257	-3.608	-3.927
Australia	-0.147	-0.128	-0.193	-0.161	-0.130	-0.145	-0.124	-0.145	-0.157	-0.125
t-stat	-2.328	-0.947	-1.543	-1.330	-1.097	-1.252	-1.087	-1.299	-1.426	-1.145
Belgium	-0.503*	-0.492*	-0.431*	-0.395*	-0.369*	-0.390*	-0.385*	-0.417*	-0.440*	-0.439*
t-stat	-5.391	-3.452	-3.196	-3.117	-2.958	-3.065	-2.892	-3.083	-3.200	-2.845
Brazil	-0.170	NA	NA	-0.229	-0.260*	-0.187*	-0.168*	0.145	-0.095	-0.104
t-stat	-3.068	--	--	-1.624	-2.193	-1.749	-1.733	-1.595	-1.086	-1.257
Canada	-0.219*	-0.037	-0.117	-0.130	-0.096	-0.062	-0.131*	-0.174*	-0.194*	-0.250*
t-stat	-3.716	-0.294	-1.181	-1.432	-1.123	-0.745	-1.676	-2.299	-2.587	-3.293
Chile	-0.281*	-0.261*	-0.258*	-0.178	-0.239*	-0.299*	-0.305*	-0.327*	-0.266*	-0.305*
t-stat	-3.512	-2.045	-2.188	-1.555	-2.212	-2.787	-2.791	-2.941	-2.342	-2.714
Denmark	-0.182*	-0.089	-0.123	-0.215*	-0.215*	-0.194*	-0.178*	-0.188*	-0.191*	-0.166*
t-stat	-3.367	-0.943	-1.445	-2.663	-2.673	-2.352	-2.098	-2.224	-2.292	-2.006
Finland	-0.627*	-0.632*	-0.556*	-0.578*	-0.618*	-0.635*	-0.675*	-0.635*	-0.633*	-0.647*
t-stat	-8.099	-5.805	-5.141	-5.289	-5.559	-5.523	-5.678	-5.223	-5.053	-5.179
France	-0.195	-0.249*	-0.302*	-0.303*	-0.260*	-0.241*	-0.258*	-0.373*	-0.326*	-0.082
t-stat	-3.103	-1.799	-2.351	-2.335	-1.942	-1.712	-1.802	-2.564	-2.276	-0.545
Germany	-0.171*	-0.036	-0.076	-0.105	-0.137*	-0.174*	-0.181*	-0.182*	-0.173*	-0.168*
t-stat	-3.313	-0.395	-0.960	-1.426	-1.942	-2.531	-2.671	-2.701	-2.540	-2.433
Italy	-0.197	-0.252*	-0.248*	-0.265*	-0.269*	-0.249*	-0.191*	-0.194*	-0.118	-0.100
t-stat	-3.064	-1.798	-2.174	-2.521	-2.650	-2.484	-1.923	-1.950	-1.193	-1.023
Japan	-0.229*	-0.240*	-0.193*	-0.175*	-0.151*	-0.162	-0.161*	-0.151*	-0.158*	-0.177*
t-stat	-4.653	-3.211	-2.851	-2.710	-2.336	-2.503	-2.483	-2.342	-2.502	-2.794
Mexico	-0.589*	-0.535*	-0.458*	-0.565*	-0.589*	-0.553*	-0.498*	-0.544*	-0.570*	-0.550*
t-stat	-6.309	-3.532	-3.022	-3.913	-4.104	-3.734	-3.319	-3.775	-4.084	-3.970
Netherlands	-0.061	0.027	0.027	-0.014	0.001	0.013	0.036	0.007	-0.020	0.004
t-stat	-1.402	0.305	0.348	-0.195	0.018	0.188	0.508	0.102	-0.308	0.065
New	-0.432*	-0.275	-0.329*	-0.460*	-0.475*	-0.475*	-0.199	-0.299	-0.436*	-0.488*
t-stat	-3.727	-1.569	-2.117	-2.920	-2.826	-2.826	-0.869	-1.546	-2.696	-3.332
Norway	-0.131	-0.141	-0.170*	-0.190*	-0.200*	-0.172*	-0.118	-0.111	-0.084	-0.092
t-stat	-2.620	-1.382	-1.882	-2.201	-2.307	-1.909	-1.241	-1.120	-0.847	-0.935
Spain	-0.071	-0.063	-0.098	-0.142	-0.156	-0.167*	-0.075	-0.050	-0.029	-0.010
t-stat	-1.715	-0.553	-0.963	-1.426	-1.565	-1.679	-0.773	-0.538	-0.327	-0.114
Sweden	-0.279*	-0.289*	-0.257*	-0.278*	-0.280*	-0.294*	-0.279*	-0.301*	-0.314*	-0.294*
t-stat	-4.221	-2.577	-2.588	-3.028	-3.114	-3.266	-3.052	-3.263	-3.372	-3.045
Switzerland	-0.110	0.005	-0.066	-0.154	-0.146	-0.096	-0.061	-0.117	-0.113	-0.078
t-stat	-1.888	0.034	-0.512	-1.354	-1.367	-0.935	-0.596	-1.140	-1.135	-0.823
UK	-0.107	NA	NA	-0.140	-0.185	-0.056	-0.054	-0.062	-0.042	-0.055
t-stat	-1.869	--	--	-0.721	-1.106	-0.396	-0.427	-0.535	-0.394	-0.526

*significant at the 5% level, critical values for the ADL Model column were obtained from Banerjee, Dolado, and Mestre (1998). The italicized coefficient in bold font for each country is from the equation that minimizes the sum of the squared residuals among the estimations with instruments.

$$\Delta f_t = d'_{11} + \delta_1 f_{t-1} + \gamma p_{t-1}^{US} + \phi' \Delta p_t^{US} + v_t \quad \text{Without instrument}$$

$$w_t = (w_{1t}, w_{2t}) = \left[(f_{t-1} - f_{t-m-1}), (p_{t-1}^{US} - p_{t-m-1}^{US}) \right] \quad \text{Instrument}$$

Table 5 displays the t-statistics for the estimated δ_l from the second step of the Engle-Granger (EG) procedure shown in equation (7) compared to those derived from the EG approach using for the estimated residuals, $(f_{t-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}p_{t-1}^{US})$. Failure to reject the null indicates the presence of a unit root in the estimated equation, that is, nonstationary residuals, implying the absence of a cointegrating relation between the dollar-denominated foreign price level and the US price level over the sample period. Thus, failure to reject the null indicates an absence of support for PPP. The Schwarz criterion determines lag length in the unit root tests applied to the estimate residuals with the same lag lengths imposed in the IV estimations.

As results in Table 5 show, unit root tests applied to the estimated errors residuals from equation (7) for each country reject the null at the 5% level in twelve instances, reflecting just slightly more evidence of PPP than the traditional ECM and ADL models. Eight of these twelve countries are the same as those showing evidence of PPP from the standard ADL estimations. The IV estimations show substantial evidence of PPP, although once again conclusions can change with the choice of instrument. In seventeen of the twenty countries, at least six of the nine IV specifications have significant coefficients, that is the null hypothesis of nonstationary residuals is rejected, evidence supportive of PPP. Considering just the results from the IV estimation that minimizes the SSR for each country also indicates strong evidence of PPP, a significant coefficient appears in seventeen of twenty cases. Again, there is some evidence of sensitivity to the choice of instrument. Taking two examples, in the case of Argentina the t-stat on the estimated coefficient δ_l ranges from -4.135 to -1.514 while for Germany the t-stats vary from -2.142 to -.287.

Interestingly, the Engle-Granger tests with instruments indicate strong evidence of purchasing power parity relative to the US dollar for the Netherlands, Norway, Spain,

Table 5 t-Statistics on Estimated δ_l from Equation 7, Without and With Instruments.

Country	Lags	No. obs.	Unit Root Test	Instruments								
				m = 4	m = 5	m = 6	m = 7	m = 8	m = 9	m = 10	m = 11	m = 12
Argentina	0	110	-4.882*	-4.114*	-3.871*	-3.193*	-1.514	-1.564	-2.538*	-3.412*	-3.772*	-4.135*
Australia	0	125	-2.732	-1.473	-2.018*	-1.802*	-1.611	-1.815*	-1.656*	-1.835	-1.976	-1.778*
Belgium	1	115	-5.464*	-3.386*	-3.392	-3.317*	-3.188*	-3.363*	-3.218*	-3.436*	-3.628*	-3.340*
Brazil	0	106	-2.642	.346	-0.364	-0.829	-1.602	-1.118	-1.231	-1.289	-1.123	-1.166
Canada	0	125	-3.040	.667	-0.156	-0.618	-.612	-0.460	-1.369	-2.251*	-2.713*	-3.343*
Chile	0	82	-1.685	-1.596	-1.626	-1.130	-1.747*	-2.221*	-2.292*	-2.414*	-2.283*	-2.283*
Denmark	1	115	-3.930*	-1.123	-1.895*	-3.183*	-3.202*	-2.834*	-2.454*	-2.583*	-2.739*	-2.581*
Finland	1	114	-6.229*	-4.278*	-3.927*	-4.114*	-4.222*	-4.172*	-4.316*	-3.844*	-3.636*	-3.407*
France	1	115	-4.433*	-3.010*	-3.492*	-3.561*	-3.377*	-3.377*	-3.415*	-3.346*	-3.415*	-2.697*
Germany	0	115	-3.210	-.287	-0.724	-1.157	-1.654*	-2.142*	-2.123*	-2.084*	-2.036*	-2.044*
Italy	1	115	-3.973*	-1.565	-1.980*	-2.388*	-2.764*	-2.830*	-2.399*	-2.387*	-1.657*	-1.631
Japan	1	111	-5.093*	-3.767*	-3.134*	-2.977*	-2.818*	-2.914*	-2.885*	-2.681*	-2.781*	-3.078*
Mexico	1	109	-6.627*	-4.007*	-4.024*	-4.693*	-4.671*	-4.221*	-3.837*	-4.228*	-4.450*	-4.177*
Netherlands	1	125	-3.781	-1.863*	-1.695*	-2.081*	-1.683*	-1.731*	-1.554	-2.050*	-2.322*	-1.907*
New Zealand	1	47	-4.213*	-2.620*	-2.894*	-3.675*	-3.480*	-2.737*	-1.379	-1.928*	-3.100*	-3.729*
Norway	1	125	-4.119*	-2.079*	-2.814*	-3.047*	-3.103*	-2.896*	-2.492*	-2.593*	-2.473*	-2.477*
Spain	1	115	-3.203	-2.673*	-2.859*	-2.999*	-2.890*	-2.917*	-2.308*	-2.306*	-2.203*	-2.070*
Sweden	1	115	-4.382*	-1.923*	-2.092*	-2.525*	-2.499*	-2.661*	-2.490*	-2.838*	-3.076*	-2.635*
Switzerland	1	103	-4.249*	-2.204*	-2.410*	-3.013*	-2.944*	-2.376*	-1.842*	-2.411*	-2.741*	-2.512*
UK	0	125	-3.056	-1.538	-1.916*	-2.219*	-2.511*	-1.774*	-1.666*	-1.794*	-1.678*	-1.883*

*significant at the 5% level. Critical values for the test statistic displayed in the unit root test column are from Table C, page 441 of Enders (2004). The italicized t statistic in bold font for each country is from the equation with the minimum sum of the squared residuals among the estimations with instruments. Schwarz criterion used to determine lag length.

$$\Delta(f_t - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} p_t^{US}) = \delta_1 (f_{t-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} p_{t-1}^{US}) + \sum_{i=1}^j \phi_i \Delta(f_{t-i} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta} p_{t-i}^{US}) + u_t \text{ without instrument}$$

$$w_t = (f_{t-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}' p_{t-1}^{US}) - (f_{t-m-1} - \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}' p_{t-m-1}^{US}) \text{ Instrument}$$

Switzerland, and the UK. In contrast, the ECM and ADL IV estimations for these five countries reveal virtually no support for PPP.

Conclusions

The ECM and ADL model, with or without instrumental variables, and the traditional EG two-step approach provide some support for the PPP hypothesis, evidence broadly consistent with that from earlier studies using the Taylor data, although somewhat weaker than Taylor found in his original study. The strongest evidence in favor of PPP is from the Engle-Granger procedure with instruments. Using the criterion of selecting a value of m that minimizes the SSR, seventeen of the twenty countries in the sample show results supportive of PPP. Conclusions from the EG method with instruments are similar to Taylor's original findings.

How does the ILE instrumental variable test for cointegration compare to traditional methods? The ILE approach certainly simplifies single equation cointegration tests in that the asymptotic distribution of the t statistic is standard normal. But, when instruments are used in the standard, single equation cointegration tests the results are often not robust with respect to choice of instrument, at least when applied to Taylor's data on exchange rates and price levels. This absence of robustness to the choice of m is different from the ILE results using UK money demand. One possible reason for the lack of robustness may be that the lag lengths for the variables in the IV estimations are restricted to be the same as in the standard (ECM, ADL, or EG) specification, thus lag lengths are not optimally chosen. Using a criterion for the selection of lag length might increase robustness of the IV specification. An important addition to the ILE test would be the development of criteria for the optimal selection of the instrument.

How do the three different tests with instrumental variables compare? Results from the ADL and ECM tests with IV are almost identical for nineteen of the twenty countries in the study. The exception is Sweden for which the ECM and ADL results are inexplicably different. For many countries, the EG test results with instrumental variables differ from the other two tests. Since the use of IVs eliminates the nuisance parameter problem, the source(s) of the differences must lie in other aspects of the tests; a subject for future study.

Appendix A-Countries and Period Coverage

Country	Taylor data-years of coverage	Updated to
Argentina	1884-1996	2006
Australia	1870-1996	2007
Belgium	1870-1996	2007
Brazil	1880-1996	2007
Canada	1870-1996	2007
Denmark	1880-1996	2007
Finland	1881-1996	2007
France	1880-1996	2007
Germany	1880-1996	2007
Italy	1880-1996	2007
Japan	1885-1996	2007
Mexico	1886-1996	2007
Netherlands	1870-1996	2007
Norway	1870-1996	2007
Portugal	1890-1996	2007
Spain	1880-1996	2007
Sweden	1880-1996	2007
Switzerland	1892-1996	2007
UK	1850-1996	2007
US	1870-1996	2007
Additional countries in the data set but for which results are not reported in Taylor (2002)		
Chile	1913-1996	2007
Greece	1948-1996	2007
New Zealand	1948-1996	2007

Appendix B-Unit Root Tests
B-1Unit Root Tests on the Nominal Exchange Rate

Unit root tests	ADF		DF-GLS		KPSS	
	Null-unit root in level		Null-unit root in level		Null-stationary	
Country	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const
Argentina	-0.819	1.350	-0.526	1.854	0.295*	0.965*
Australia	-2.407	0.512	-2.348	1.378	0.220*	1.411*
Belgium	-0.982	-1.561	-1.245	-0.464	0.270*	1.058*
Brazil	-1.384	0.179	-1.246	0.436	0.273*	0.908*
Canada	-3.062	-2.416	-3.036*	-1.322	0.198*	0.977*
Denmark	-4.262*	-1.996	-4.205*	-1.254	0.178*	1.196*
Finland	-1.698	-1.042	-1.791	0.343	0.196*	1.295*
France	-1.196	-0.926	-1.301	0.377	0.182*	1.282*
Germany	-2.193	-1.920	-2.248	-0.806	0.262*	1.010*
Italy	-2.390	-0.736	-1.735	0.394	0.130*	1.295*
Japan	-2.079	-1.242	-2.146	-0.313	0.158*	1.069*
Mexico	-0.993	0.974	-0.774	2.020	0.266*	1.031*
Netherlands	-2.584	-2.573	-2.493	-2.366*	0.146*	0.143
Norway	-4.157*	-2.407	-4.183*	-1.377	0.080	1.270*
Portugal	-2.280	-1.188	-2.333	0.144	0.134*	1.109*
Spain	-2.415	-0.600	-1.937	0.492	0.193*	1.311*
Sweden	-4.728*	-1.478	-3.106*	-1.002	0.221*	1.155*
Switzerland	-2.070	0.022	-1.556	0.580	0.260*	1.052*
UK	-2.600	-0.907	-2.097	-0.324	0.299*	1.294*
US	na	na	na	na	na	na
Additional countries						
Chile	-2.082	-0.319	-1.538	0.439	0.222*	1.207*
Greece	-2.731	-2.425	-1.825	0.192	0.114	0.912*
New Zealand	-2.377	-1.296	-2.569	-0.590	0.112	0.859*

Note: Schwarz criterion used to select lag length in the ADF, DF-GLS tests.

* Significant at 5%

B-2 Unit Root Tests on the Price Level

Unit root tests	ADF		DF-GLS		KPSS	
	Null-unit root in level		Null-unit root in level		Null-stationary	
Country	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const
Argentina	-1.235	0.449	-1.492	-0.031	0.298*	0.987*
Australia	-1.591	1.308	-0.952	1.226	0.347*	1.328*
Belgium	-3.139	-0.091	-1.780	1.439	0.139*	1.440*
Brazil	-1.255	0.493	-1.257	0.632	0.277*	0.945*
Canada	-1.729	1.281	-0.825	2.270	0.317*	1.326*
Denmark	-2.234	0.591	-1.106	1.326	0.290*	1.297*
Finland	-2.872	-0.252	-1.984	1.364	0.095	1.343*
France	-3.262*	-0.830	-2.395	0.015	0.153*	1.342*
Germany	-1.565	-1.308	-1.659	-0.169	0.230*	1.086*
Italy	-3.036	-0.175	-2.041	0.948	0.164*	1.330*
Japan	-2.371	-1.126	-2.344	0.013	0.134*	1.254*
Mexico	-0.951	0.985	-0.792	1.542	0.284*	1.085*
Netherlands	-1.919	0.962	-0.834	1.831	0.324*	1.341*
Norway	-2.112	0.296	-1.418	1.254	0.293*	1.353*
Portugal	-3.662*	-0.772	-3.381*	0.180	0.101	1.193*
Spain	-2.377	1.072	-0.922	2.037	0.317*	1.307*
Sweden	-2.006	0.662	-1.049	1.618	0.294*	1.285*
Switzerland	-2.556	-0.187	-2.129	1.286	0.186*	1.203*
UK	-1.806	0.864	-0.906	1.510	0.331*	1.302*
US	-2.029	1.177	-0.695	1.665	0.324*	1.323*
Additional countries						
Chile	-1.969	0.045	-1.292	0.401	0.228*	1.216*
Greece	-2.466	-0.336	-2.174	0.005	0.173*	0.924*
New Zealand	-4.550*	-1.160	-4.245*	-0.313	0.121*	0.936*

Note: Schwarz criterion used to select lag length in the ADF, DF-GLS tests.

* Significant at 5%

B-3 Unit Root Tests on the Dollar-denominated Price Level

Unit root tests	ADF		DF-GLS		KPSS	
	Null-unit root in level		Null-unit root in level		Null-stationary	
Country	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const
Argentina	-3.821*	-1.420	-3.338*	-0.928	0.268*	1.121*
Australia	-1.999	-0.419	-1.369	0.154	0.333*	1.230*
Belgium	-3.466*	-0.085	-2.727*	0.766	0.283*	1.269*
Brazil	-2.226	-0.378	-2.218	0.613	0.206*	1.132*
Canada	-1.637	1.581	-0.640	2.484	0.316*	1.343*
Denmark	-1.667	1.322	-0.774	2.554	0.301*	1.237*
Finland	-2.745	-0.108	-2.027	0.741	0.265*	1.248*
France	-1.629	1.130	-0.801	1.876	0.305*	1.197*
Germany	-3.398*	-2.899*	-3.267*	-2.891*	0.096	0.606*
Italy	-2.238	0.484	-1.472	1.405	0.299*	1.265*
Japan	-3.045	-0.689	-2.618	0.350	0.222*	1.231*
Mexico	-4.115*	-0.573	-2.527	-0.019	0.275*	1.167*
Netherlands	-1.842	1.168	-0.817	1.827	0.326*	1.273*
Norway	-2.058	0.366	-1.433	1.109	0.301*	1.284*
Portugal	-1.195	1.146	-0.723	1.850	0.303*	1.093*
Spain	-1.924	0.391	-1.351	0.964	0.287*	1.143*
Sweden	-2.264	0.554	-1.382	1.741	0.259*	1.283*
Switzerland	-1.751	0.385	-1.327	1.856	0.247*	1.175*
UK	-1.282	1.757	-0.439	2.806	0.310*	1.272*
US	na	na	na	na	na	na
Additional countries						
Chile	-3.797*	-2.980*	-3.840*	-2.349*	0.080	0.679*
Greece	-7.341*	0.603	-0.739	-0.109	0.174*	0.857*
New Zealand	-2.919	0.215	-2.614	0.470	0.112	0.951*

Note: Schwarz criterion used to select lag length in the ADF, DF-GLS tests.

* Significant at 5%

B-4 Tests for a Second Unit Root in the Nominal Exchange Rate

Unit root tests	ADF		DF-GLS		KPSS	
	Null-2 nd unit root		Null-2 nd unit root		Null-stationary 1 st dif.	
Country	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const
Argentina	-6.678*	-6.115*	-6.364*	-6.131*	0.098	0.573*
Australia	-6.424*	-6.394*	-4.099*	-5.954*	0.072	0.269
Belgium	-7.872*	-7.774*	-3.537*	-2.499*	0.112	0.227
Brazil	-3.802*	-3.507*	-3.746*	-3.480*	0.077	0.471*
Canada	-8.952*	-8.955*	-8.474*	-7.648*	0.062	0.081
Denmark	-9.794*	-9.809*	-9.751*	-9.835*	0.035	0.056
Finland	-7.541*	-7.543*	-7.474*	-7.312*	0.121*	0.159
France	-6.734*	-6.733*	-6.681*	-6.560*	0.175*	0.199
Germany	-2.806	-2.708*	-2.714*	-2.664*	0.088	0.190
Italy	-7.310*	-7.341*	-7.130*	-4.513*	0.101	0.101
Japan	-5.238*	-5.236*	-5.280*	-5.253*	0.115	0.144
Mexico	-9.656*	-9.477*	-9.641*	-9.511*	0.068	0.396*
Netherlands	-8.360*	-8.335*	-8.354*	-8.168*	0.046	0.123
Norway	-8.807*	-8.823*	-8.753*	-8.816*	0.028	0.041
Portugal	-5.875*	-5.886*	-5.691*	-5.090*	0.061	0.091
Spain	-7.700*	-7.732*	-7.700*	-7.659*	0.132*	0.136
Sweden	-9.609*	-9.643*	-9.523*	-9.601*	0.080	0.096
Switzerland	-8.409*	-8.368*	-8.285*	-7.350*	0.047	0.186
UK	-11.015*	-11.053*	-10.954*	-11.012*	0.129*	0.147
US	na	na	na	na	na	na
Additional countries						
Chile	-3.615*	-3.632*	-3.646*	-3.458*	0.185*	0.256
Greece	-7.272*	-7.008*	-7.157*	-6.753*	0.106*	0.189
New Zealand	-6.448*	-6.505*	-4.213*	-2.549*	0.065	0.143

Note: Schwarz criterion used to select lag length in the ADF, DF-GLS tests.

* Significant at 5%

B-5 Tests for a Second Unit Root in the Price Level

Unit root tests	ADF		DF-GLS		KPSS	
	Null-2 nd unit root		Null-2 nd unit root		Null-stationary 1 st dif.	
Country	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const
Argentina	-3.572*	-3.183*	-3.460*	-3.170*	0.091	0.546*
Australia	-5.459*	-3.456*	-5.448*	-2.558*	0.072	0.657*
Belgium	-9.847*	-9.865*	-9.917*	-9.848*	0.111	0.142
Brazil	-3.455*	-2.956*	-3.239*	-2.960*	0.075	0.490*
Canada	-6.787*	-6.379*	-6.527*	-6.365*	0.062	0.504*
Denmark	-4.374*	-4.153*	-3.798*	-3.435*	0.074	0.348*
Finland	-6.810*	-6.832*	-6.861*	-6.852*	0.099	0.105
France	-2.915	-2.971*	-2.388	-2.034*	0.150*	0.175
Germany	-9.089*	-9.094*	-9.117*	-9.087*	0.081	0.132
Italy	-5.493*	-5.483*	-5.532*	-5.432*	0.100	0.148
Japan	-3.573*	-3.575*	-3.373*	-3.065*	0.114	0.116
Mexico	-4.730*	-4.385*	-4.602*	-3.094*	0.074	0.531*
Netherlands	-6.787*	-6.510*	-6.607*	-4.924*	0.085	0.471*
Norway	-5.574*	-5.463*	-5.596*	-5.067*	0.049	0.277
Portugal	-2.545	-2.577	-2.566	-2.455*	0.059	0.079
Spain	-5.798*	-5.459*	-5.825*	-4.947*	0.124*	0.543*
Sweden	-5.377*	-5.162*	-5.161*	-5.070*	0.065	0.353*
Switzerland	-5.822*	-5.833*	-5.599*	-4.726*	0.050	0.090
UK	-5.255*	-4.860*	-5.120*	-4.871*	0.070	0.521*
US	-5.985*	-5.523*	-5.507*	-3.326*	0.066	0.671*
Additional countries						
Chile	-4.278*	-4.250*	-4.316*	-4.064*	0.168*	0.247
Greece	-2.071	-2.073	-2.011	-1.876*	0.176*	0.208
New Zealand	-2.382	-2.334	-2.229	-2.071	0.192*	0.198

Note: Schwarz criterion used to select lag length in the ADF, DF-GLS tests.

* Significant at 5%

B-6 Tests for a Second Unit Root in the Dollar-denominated Price Level

Unit root tests	ADF		DF-GLS		KPSS	
	Null-2 nd unit root		Null-2 nd unit root		Null-stationary 1 st dif.	
Country	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const	Const,t	Const
Argentina	-8.687*	-8.682*	-12.233*	-11.631*	0.176*	0.262
Australia	-5.943*	-6.114*	-4.026*	-4.935*	0.115	0.170
Belgium	-8.839*	-8.793*	-8.277*	-8.149*	0.057	0.196
Brazil	-9.754*	-9.746*	-9.666*	-9.451*	0.033	0.097
Canada	-8.190*	-7.712*	-8.221*	-7.493*	0.042	0.614
Denmark	-9.480*	-9.233*	-9.496*	-9.253*	0.040	0.415*
Finland	-9.469*	-9.438*	-9.336*	-8.444*	0.148*	0.306
France	-8.944*	-8.607*	-8.923*	-8.292*	0.046	0.420*
Germany	-10.592*	-10.631*	-10.677*	-10.671*	0.025	0.031
Italy	-9.879*	-9.786*	-9.947*	-9.693*	0.043	0.319
Japan	-6.450*	-6.478*	-5.858*	-4.575*	0.045	0.095
Mexico	-11.108*	-11.092*	-10.806*	-9.300*	0.120*	0.316
Netherlands	-8.781*	-8.378*	-8.070*	-7.567*	0.047	0.659*
Norway	-7.674*	-7.532*	-7.725*	-7.393*	0.034	0.350*
Portugal	-8.417*	-8.102*	-7.249*	-1.385	0.500*	0.354*
Spain	-7.898*	-7.726*	-7.947*	-7.652*	0.056	0.419*
Sweden	-8.352*	-8.232*	-8.360*	-8.265*	0.040	0.195
Switzerland	-7.461*	-7.409*	-6.198*	-4.514*	0.052	0.201
UK	-9.939*	-9.555*	-9.778*	-9.554*	0.045	0.559*
US	na	na	na	na	na	na
Additional countries						
Chile	-11.407*	-11.463*	-11.531*	-11.526*	0.082	0.096
Greece	-8.340*	-8.259*	-8.451*	-7.447*	0.135*	0.391*
New Zealand	-6.673*	-6.761*	-4.127*	-2.482*	0.081	0.124

Note: Schwarz criterion used to select lag length in the ADF, DF-GLS tests.

* Significant at 5%

B-7 Conclusions from Unit Root Tests

Unit root tests	Nominal Exchange Rate			Price Level			Dollar-denominated Price Level			
	Country	Level	1 st dif	I(?)	Level	1 st dif	I(?)	Level	1 st dif	I(?)
Argentina	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	?	S	?	
Australia	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Belgium	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	?	S	?	
Brazil	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Canada	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Denmark	?	S	?	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Finland	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
France	UR	S	I(1)	UR	?	?	UR	S	I(1)	
Germany	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	S	S	S	
Italy	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Japan	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Mexico	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Netherlands	?	S	?	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Norway	?	S	?	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Portugal	UR	S	I(1)	?	?	?	UR	?	?	
Spain	UR	S	I(1)	UR	?	?	UR	S	I(1)	
Sweden	?	S	?	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
Switzerland	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
UK	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	
US	NA	NA	NA	UR	S	I(1)	NA	NA	NA	
Additional Countries										
Chile	UR	S	I(1)	UR	S	I(1)	S	S	S	
Greece	UR	S	I(1)	UR	UR	I(2)	UR	?	?	
New Zealand	UR	S	I(1)	?	UR	?	UR	S	I(1)	

⁺ In fact, the results actually suggest that the logged price level has *at least* two unit roots. No tests were conducted to check for additional orders of integration.
UR-unit root, S-stationary, NA-not applicable

References

- Banerjee, A; J.J. Dolado; and R. Mestre, 1998. Error-correction mechanism for cointegration in a single-equation framework, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 19, 268-283.
- Elliott, G., T. Rothenberg, and J.H. Stock, 1996. Efficient tests for an autoregressive unit root, *Econometrica* 64, 813-836.
- Enders, W. *Applied Econometric Time Series*, 2nd edition, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 2004.
- Enders, W., K.S. Im, J. Lee and M. Strazicich (2008) IV threshold cointegration tests and the Taylor rule, forthcoming in *Special Issue of Economic Modelling in Honor of PAVB Swamy*
- Ericsson, N.R. and J.G. MacKinnon, 2002. Distributions of error corrections tests for cointegration, *Econometrics Journal* 5, 285-318. Computer program available at <http://www.econ.queensu.ca/faculty/mackinnon/>.
- Im, K.S; J. Lee; and W. Enders, 2008. Cointegration tests using instrumental variables with an example of the U.K. demand for money. Unpublished working paper.
- Kwiatkowski, D.; P.C.B Phillips; P. Schmidt; and Y. Shin, 1992. Testing the null hypothesis of stationarity against the alternative of a unit-root, *Journal of Econometrics* 54, 159-178.
- Lopez, C.; C.J. Murray; and D.H. Papell, 2005. State of the art unit root tests and purchasing power parity, *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 37 (April) (2) 361-369.
- Pesavento, E., 2007. Residuals based tests for the null of no cointegration: An analytical comparison, *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 28 (January) (1) 111-137.
- _____, 2004. An analytical evaluation of the power of tests for the absence of cointegration, *Journal of Econometrics*, 122 (October) (2) 349-384.
- Rogoff, K., 1996. The purchasing power parity puzzle. *Journal of Economic Literature* 34, 647-668.
- Sarno, L. and M.P. Taylor, 2002. *The Economics of Exchange Rates*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Taylor, A.T., 2002. A century of purchasing-power parity. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84, 139-150.
- _____ and Taylor M.P., 2004. The purchasing power parity debate. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18, 135-158.

Wallace, F.H. and G.L. Shelley, 2006. An alternative test of purchasing power parity, *Economics Letters*, 92 (August) (2) 177-183.

Wallace, F.H. , R. Lozano-Cortés, and L.F. Cabrera-Castellanos, 2008. Pruebas de cointegración de paridad de poder de compra. *EconoQuantum* 4, 7-25.