

# The Purchasing Power Parity Debate

Alan M. Taylor and Mark P. Taylor

*Our willingness to pay a certain price for foreign money must ultimately and essentially be due to the fact that this money possesses a purchasing power as against commodities and services in that country. On the other hand, when we offer so and so much of our own money, we are actually offering a purchasing power as against commodities and services in our own country. Our valuation of a foreign currency in terms of our own, therefore, mainly depends on the relative purchasing power of the two currencies in their respective countries.*

Gustav Cassel, economist (1922, pp. 138–39)

*The fundamental things apply*

*As time goes by.*

Herman Hupfeld, songwriter (1931; from the film *Casablanca*, 1942)

**P**urchasing power parity (PPP) is a disarmingly simple theory that holds that the nominal exchange rate between two currencies should be equal to the ratio of aggregate price levels between the two countries, so that a unit of currency of one country will have the same purchasing power in a foreign country. The PPP theory has a long history in economics, dating back several centuries, but the specific terminology of purchasing power parity was introduced in the years after World War I during the international policy debate concerning the appropriate level for nominal exchange rates among the major industrialized countries after the large-scale inflations during and after the war (Cassel, 1918). Since then, the idea of PPP has become embedded in how many international economists think about the world. For example, Dornbusch and Krugman (1976) noted: “Under the skin of any international economist lies a deep-seated belief in some variant of the PPP theory of the exchange rate.” Rogoff (1996) expressed much the same

■ Alan M. Taylor is Professor of Economics and Chancellor’s Fellow, University of California at Davis, Davis, California, and Research Associate, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Mark P. Taylor is Professor of Macroeconomics, University of Warwick, United Kingdom. Both authors are Research Fellows, Centre for Economic Policy Research, London, United Kingdom. Their e-mail addresses are <amtaylor@ucdavis.edu> and <mark.taylor@warwick.ac.uk>, respectively.

sentiment: “While few empirically literate economists take PPP seriously as a short-term proposition, most instinctively believe in some variant of purchasing power parity as an anchor for long-run real exchange rates.”

The question of how exchange rates adjust is central to exchange rate policy, since countries with fixed exchange rates need to know what the equilibrium exchange rate is likely to be and countries with variable exchange rates would like to know what level and variation in real and nominal exchange rates they should expect. In broader terms, the question of whether exchange rates adjust toward a level established by purchasing power parity helps to determine the extent to which the international macroeconomic system is self-equilibrating.

### **Should PPP Hold? Does PPP Hold?**

The general idea behind purchasing power parity is that a unit of currency should be able to buy the same basket of goods in one country as the equivalent amount of foreign currency, at the going exchange rate, can buy in a foreign country, so that there is parity in the purchasing power of the unit of currency across the two economies. One very simple way of gauging whether there may be discrepancies from PPP is to compare the prices of similar or identical goods from the basket in the two countries. For example, the *Economist* newspaper publishes the prices of McDonald’s Big Mac hamburgers around the world and compares them in a common currency, the U.S. dollar, at the market exchange rate as a simple measure of whether a currency is overvalued or undervalued relative to the dollar at the current exchange rate (on the supposition that the currency would be valued just right if the dollar price of the burger were the same as in the United States). In January 2004, the cheapest burger was in China, at \$1.23, compared with an average American price of \$2.80. According to the Big Mac index, therefore, this implied that China’s yuan was 56 percent undervalued. The average price of a Big Mac in the euro area countries was \$3.48, suggesting that the euro was 24 percent overvalued against the dollar. In contrast, the Japanese yen was 12 percent undervalued on the Big Mac PPP standard. The Big Mac index has proved so popular that the *Economist* has also started to publish prices around the world of another globally invariable standard of value: a tall latte cup of coffee from Starbucks.

While the Big Mac and tall latte indices are an immediately engaging and fun way to think about exchange rates, it is easy to come up with good reasons why the prices of coffee and burgers might differ internationally, most of which are related to the fact that many of the inputs into a tall latte or a Big Mac cannot be traded internationally or not easily at least: each good contains a high service component—the wages of the person serving the food and drink—and a high property rental component—the cost of providing you with somewhere to sit and sip your coffee or munch your two beef patties on a sesame seed bun with secret-recipe sauce. Neither the service-sector labor nor the property (nor the trademark sauce) is easily arbitrated internationally, and advocates of PPP have generally based their view largely on arguments relating to international goods arbitrage. Thus, while these

indices may give a lighthearted and suggestive idea of the relative value of currencies, they should be treated with caution.

The idea that purchasing power parity may hold because of international goods arbitrage is related to the so-called Law of One Price, which holds that the price of an internationally traded good should be the same anywhere in the world once that price is expressed in a common currency, since people could make a riskless profit by shipping the goods from locations where the price is low to locations where the price is high (for example, by arbitraging). If the same goods enter each country's market basket used to construct the aggregate price level—and with the same weight—then the Law of One Price implies that a PPP exchange rate should hold between the countries concerned.

Possible objections to this line of reasoning are immediate. For example, the presence of transactions costs—perhaps arising from transport costs, taxes, tariffs and duties and nontariff barriers—would induce a violation of the Law of One Price. Engel and Rogers (1996), for example, looked at the price differentials between similar goods in cities across the United States and Canada and reported evidence broadly in support of this hypothesis: they found that the volatility of the price differential tended to be larger the greater the distance between the cities concerned, and it increased substantially when prices in cities in different countries were compared (the so-called “border effect”).

Moreover, not all goods are traded between all countries, and the weight attached to similar goods in aggregate price indices will differ across countries. In addition, different countries tend to produce goods that are differentiated rather than perfectly substitutable. Some of these problems could be addressed, at least in principle, with better data. Also, since PPP is based on traded goods, it might be more usefully tested with producer price indices that tend to contain the prices of more manufactured tradables, rather than consumer price indices, which tend to reflect the prices of relatively more nontradables, such as many services. A recent theoretical and empirical literature, discussed below, has attempted to allow for short-run deviations from PPP arising from sources such as these, while retaining PPP in some form as a long-run average or equilibrium.

These objections notwithstanding, however, it is often asserted that the PPP theory of exchange rates will hold at least approximately because of the possibility of international goods arbitrage. There are two senses in which the PPP hypothesis might hold. *Absolute* purchasing power parity holds when the purchasing power of a unit of currency is exactly equal in the domestic economy and in a foreign economy, once it is converted into foreign currency at the market exchange rate. However, it is often difficult to determine whether literally the same basket of goods is available in two different countries. Thus, it is common to test *relative* PPP, which holds that the percentage change in the exchange rate over a given period just offsets the difference in inflation rates in the countries concerned over the same period. If absolute PPP holds, then relative PPP must also hold; however, if relative PPP holds, then absolute PPP does not necessarily hold, since it is possible that common changes in nominal exchange rates are happening at different levels of

purchasing power for the two currencies (perhaps because of transactions costs, for example).

To get a feel for whether PPP in either its relative or its absolute versions is a moderately good approximation to the real world, start with Figure 1. The top panel plots data on the U.S. and UK consumer price indices (CPIs) over the period 1820–2001. Both are expressed in U.S. dollar terms, which means that the UK CPI was multiplied by the number of U.S. dollars exchanging for one UK pound at that point in time. The bottom panel shows the comparison using producer price indices, using data for a slightly longer period 1791–2001.<sup>1</sup> We have (arbitrarily) normalized each of the series to be equal to zero in 1900.

At least three points are worth raising from a consideration of these graphs. First, absolute PPP did *not* hold perfectly and continuously: the correlation between the two lines is less than perfect in both cases. In other words, there are substantial short-run deviations from PPP. Second, the national price levels of the two countries, expressed in a common currency, *did* tend to move together over these long periods. Third, the correlation between the two national price levels is much greater with producer prices than with consumer prices.

Figure 2 shows several graphs using data for a large number of countries over the period 1970–1998.<sup>2</sup> Consider first the two graphs in the top row of Figure 2. For each country we calculated the one-year inflation rate in each of the 29 years and subtracted the one-year U.S. inflation rate in the same years to obtain a measure of relative inflation (using consumer price indices for the figures on the left and producer price indices for the figures on the right). We then calculated the percentage change in the dollar exchange rate for each year and, finally, we plotted relative annual inflation against exchange rate depreciation for each of the 29 years for each of the countries. If relative PPP held perfectly, then each of the scatter points would lie on a 45° ray through the origin. In the second row, we have carried out a similar exercise, except we have taken averages: we have plotted 29-year annualized average relative inflation against the average annual depreciation of the currency against the U.S. dollar over the whole period, so that there is just one scatter point for each country.


Figure 2 confirms some of the lessons of Figure 1. For small differences in annual inflation between the United States and the country concerned, the correlation between relative inflation and depreciation in each of the years seems low. Thus, relative PPP certainly does *not* appear to hold perfectly and continuously in the short run, although it appears to hold more closely for countries experiencing relatively high inflation.

When we take 29-year averages, however, the scatter plots tend to collapse onto the 45° ray. (This effect is only slightly less marked if we take averages over shorter

<sup>1</sup> See Lothian and Taylor (1996, 2004) for a guide to the sources for these data series.

<sup>2</sup> Data are from the IMF's *International Financial Statistics* database over the period 1970–1998 (data were not available after 1998 for some countries). The sample included data on consumer price indices for 20 industrialized countries and 26 developing countries, while that based on producer price indices includes 14 industrialized countries and twelve developing countries. The data set is identical to that used in Coakley, Flood, Fuertes and Taylor (2004), which contains more precise details.

Figure 1


**Dollar-Sterling PPP Over Two Centuries**

*Notes:* This figure shows U.S. and UK consumer and producer price indices expressed in U.S. dollar terms over roughly the last two centuries using a log scale with a base of 1900 = 0.

periods of ten years or so.) Thus, *relative* PPP seems to hold in a long-run sense. With the longer-run averages, the degree of correlation between relative inflation and exchange rate depreciation again seems higher when using PPIs than when using CPIs.

So the conclusions emerging from our informal eyeballing of Figures 1 and 2 seem to be the following. Neither absolute nor relative PPP appear to hold closely in the short run, although both appear to hold reasonably well as a long-run average and when there are large movements in relative prices, and both appear to hold better between producer price indices than between consumer price indices.

Figure 2

**PPP at Various Time Horizons**

Notes: This figure shows countries' cumulative inflation rate differentials against the United States in percent (vertical axis) plotted against their cumulative depreciation rates against the U.S. dollar in percent (horizontal axis). The charts on the left show CPI inflation, those on the right PPI inflation. The charts in the top row show annual rates, those in the bottom row 29-year average rates from 1970 to 1998.

In other words, as far as exchange rates are concerned, the fundamental things—relative price levels—apply increasingly as time goes by. These conclusions are in fact broadly in line with the current consensus view on PPP. So where does all the controversy arise?

## The PPP Debate: A Tour of the Past Three Decades

### The Rise and Fall of Continuous PPP

Under the Bretton Woods agreement that was signed after World War II, the U.S. dollar was tied to the price of gold, and then all other currencies were tied, or

“pegged,” to the U.S. dollar. However, in 1971, President Nixon ended the convertibility of the U.S. dollar to gold and devalued the dollar relative to gold. After the failure of attempts to restore a version of the Bretton Woods agreement, the major currencies of the world began floating against each other in March 1973.

At this time, the dominant approach to determination of exchange rates was called the “monetary approach.” This approach assumed that the purchasing power parity exchange rate held continuously (Frenkel, 1976; Taylor, 1995; Frankel and Rose, 1995). Advocates of this approach argued that since the exchange rate is the relative price of two monies, that relative price should be determined by the relative balance of supply and demand in the respective money markets in an asset market equilibrium. Exactly how percentage changes in relative money supplies translated, other things equal, into exactly matching exchange rate movements was not immediately obvious, however, unless one resorted to the earlier argument based on goods arbitrage: that is, changes in the relative money supply affect relative prices, including relative traded goods prices, which then leads to international goods arbitrage.

A wave of empirical studies in the late 1970s tested whether continuous purchasing power parity did indeed hold, as well as other implications of the monetary approach to the exchange rate, and the initial results were encouraging (Frenkel and Johnson, 1978). With the benefit of hindsight, it seems that these early encouraging results arose in part because of the relative stability of the dollar during the first two or three years or so of the float (after an initial period of turbulence) and in part because of the lack of a long enough run of data with which to test the theory properly. Toward the end of the 1970s, however, the U.S. dollar did become much more volatile and more data became available to the econometricians, who subsequently showed that both continuous PPP and the simple monetary approach to the exchange rate were easily rejected. One did not have to be an econometrician, however, to witness the “collapse of purchasing power parity” (Frenkel, 1981): one could simply examine the behavior of the real exchange rate.

The real exchange rate is the nominal exchange rate (domestic price of foreign currency) multiplied by the ratio of national price levels (domestic price level divided by foreign price level); since the real exchange rate measures the purchasing power of a unit of foreign currency in the foreign economy relative to the purchasing power of an equivalent unit of domestic currency in the domestic economy, PPP would, in theory, imply a *real*, relative-price-level-adjusted exchange rate of one (although the *nominal* rate—the rate that gets reported in the *Wall Street Journal* or the *Financial Times*—could, of course, differ from one even if PPP held). In practice, if we are working with aggregate real exchange rates and hence aggregate price indices with arbitrary base periods, it may be difficult to pin down exactly when PPP held true, in order to normalize the measured real exchange rate to unity. What is clear, however, is that there will be *some* level of the measured real exchange rate that is consistent with PPP and—most importantly—that variation in the *real* exchange rate must indicate deviations from PPP (since otherwise it would be constant at the level consistent with PPP). The real trade-weighted value of the



U.S. dollar didn't change too much from 1973 to 1976, thus lending a degree of plausibility to the continuous PPP argument. But the real value of the dollar dropped sharply starting in 1977, and from then on it became increasingly clear that continuous PPP could not hold as nominal exchange rates were patently far more volatile than relative national price levels.

### **Formal Tests of (the Failure of) Long-Run PPP: Random Walks and Unit Roots**

One reaction to the failure of purchasing power parity in the short run was a theory of exchange rate overshooting, in which PPP is retained as a *long-run* equilibrium while allowing for significant short-run deviations due to sticky prices (Dornbusch, 1976). However, the search for empirical evidence of *long-run* PPP also met with disappointment.

Formal tests for evidence of PPP as a long-run phenomenon have often been based on an empirical examination of the real exchange rate. If the real exchange rate is to settle down at *any* level whatsoever, including a level consistent with PPP, it must display reversion toward its own mean. Hence, mean reversion is only a *necessary* condition for long-run PPP: to ensure long-run absolute PPP, we should have to know that the mean toward which it is reverting is in fact the PPP real exchange rate. Still, since much of this research has failed to reject the hypothesis that even this necessary condition does not hold, this has not in general been an issue.

Early empirical studies, such as those by Roll (1979) or Adler and Lehmann (1983), tested the null hypothesis that the real exchange rate does not mean revert but instead follows a random walk, the archetypal non-mean reverting time series process where changes in each period are purely random and independent. Some authors even argued that the random walk property was an implication of the efficiency of international markets, in the sense of prices and exchange rates reflecting all available information and all arbitrage opportunities being quickly exploited. Under this "efficient markets PPP" view, Roll (1979), for example, argued that the *change* in the real exchange rate, since it is effectively a measure of the one-period real return from arbitraging goods between countries, should have an expected value of zero if markets are efficient. However, this early strand of the empirical literature suffered from logical and econometric weaknesses. The theoretical underpinnings of "efficient markets PPP" failed to adjust the expected return for the real cost of financing goods arbitrage (Taylor and Sarno, 2004). Once this arbitrage adjustment is made, efficiency requires that the expected real exchange rate change be equal to the expected real interest rate differential, and long-run PPP will be implied if the latter differential is stationary.<sup>3</sup> On the empirical

<sup>3</sup> See Obstfeld and Taylor (2004) for evidence on the stationarity of real interest rate differentials. Under reasonable assumptions, the real interest rate differential will be negatively correlated with the level of the real exchange rate if a loss in international competitiveness (a real appreciation) has a net deflationary impact on the economy, reducing inflation and, other things equal, raising the real interest rate. This in turn implies mean reversion of the real exchange rate, since it implies that *changes* in the real exchange rate are negatively correlated with the *level* of the real exchange rate.



side, the evidence in favor of a random walk was at best mixed, and results depended on the criteria employed (Cumby and Obstfeld, 1984). Sharper econometric tools were still being fashioned, but—as we discuss below—they also suffered from low power just like these early tests, so for many years researchers were unlikely to reject the null hypothesis of a random walk even if it were false.

In the late 1980s, a more sophisticated econometric literature on long-run PPP developed, at the core of which was the concept of a “unit root process.” If a time series is a realization of a unit root process, then while *changes* in the variable may be to some extent predictable, the variable may still never settle down at any one particular *level*, even in the very long run. For example, suppose we estimated the following regression equation for the real exchange rate  $q_t$  over time, where  $\varepsilon_t$  is a random error and  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are unknown parameters:

$$q_t = \alpha + \beta q_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t.$$

If  $\beta = 1$ , we say that the process generating the real exchange rate contains a unit root. In that case, *changes* in the real exchange rate would be predictable—they would be equal on average to the estimated value of  $\alpha$ . The *level* of the real exchange rate would, however, not be predictable, even in the long run: since the change each period would be equal to a constant plus an unpredictable random element, the long-run level will be equal to the sum of the constant changes each period plus the sum of a large number of random elements. As these random shocks get cumulated, there is no way of telling in advance what they will add up to. (In fact, the real exchange rate would be following a random walk with drift, which is an example of a so-called unit root process.) Thus, testing the null hypothesis that  $\beta = 1$  is a test for whether the path of the real exchange rate over time does not return to any average level and thus that long-run PPP did not hold.

The flurry of empirical studies employing these types of tests on real exchange rate data among major industrialized countries that emerged toward the end of the 1980s were unanimous in their failure to reject the unit root hypothesis for major real exchange rates (for example, Taylor, 1988; Mark, 1990), although—as we shall see—this result was probably due to the low power of the tests.

In any case, at the time, this finding created great uncertainty about how to model exchange rates. At a theoretical level, there was still a consensus belief in *long-run* PPP coupled with overshooting exchange rate models; now the data were raising the possibility that even long-run PPP was a chimera. Some economists posited theoretical models to explain why the real exchange rate could in fact be non-mean reverting (as in Stockman, 1987). Others questioned the empirical methodology.

### The Power Problem

Frankel (1986, 1990) noted that while a researcher may not be able to reject the null hypothesis of a random walk real exchange rate at a given significance level, it does not mean that the researcher must then accept that hypothesis. Furthermore, Frankel pointed out that the statistical tests typically employed to

examine the long-run stability of the real exchange, at that time based on data covering just 15 years or so since 1973, may have low power to reject the null hypothesis of a unit root even if it is indeed false. This criticism would apply both to the early random walk studies and to the subsequent literature testing more formally for unit roots. It was further taken up and examined by other authors (Froot and Rogoff, 1995; Lothian and Taylor, 1996, 1997). The argument is that even if the real exchange rate tends to revert toward its mean over long periods of time, examination of one real exchange rate over a relatively short period may not yield enough information to detect this mean reversion. Using simulations in which the real exchange rate is assumed to mean revert by about 11 percent per year, the probability of rejecting at the 5 percent level the null hypothesis of a random walk real exchange rate, when in fact the real rate is actually mean reverting, is extremely low—somewhere between about 5 and 8 percent—when using 15 years of data (Lothian and Taylor, 1997; Sarno and Taylor, 2002a). With the benefit of the additional 10 to 15 years or so of data that are now available, the power of the test increases by only a couple of percentage points, and even with a century of data, there would be less than an even chance of correctly rejecting the unit root hypothesis.

Moreover, increasing the sample size by increasing the frequency of observation—moving from, say, quarterly to monthly data—won't increase the power because increasing the amount of detail concerning short-run movements can only give you more information about short-run as opposed to long-run behavior (Shiller and Perron, 1985).

### **More Statistical Power: More Years, More Countries**

If you want to get more information about the long-run behavior of a particular real exchange rate, one approach is to use more years of data. However, long periods of data usually span different exchange rate regimes, prompting questions about how to interpret the findings. Also, over long periods of time, real factors may generate structural breaks or shifts in the equilibrium real exchange rate. Once these issues are recognized, there are ways to look for possible effects of different regimes and structural shifts.

In one early study in this spirit, using annual data from 1869 to 1984 for the dollar-sterling real exchange rate, Frankel (1986) estimates a first-order autoregressive process for the real exchange rate  $q$  of the form

$$(q_t - \tilde{q}) = \varphi(q_{t-1} - \tilde{q}) + \varepsilon_t,$$

where  $\tilde{q}$  is the assumed constant equilibrium level of  $q$ ,  $\varepsilon_t$  is a random disturbance, and  $\varphi$  is the autocorrelation coefficient—an unknown parameter governing the speed of mean reversion. Notice that a proportion of  $\varphi$  times the random shock at time  $t - 1$ ,  $\varepsilon_{t-1}$ , will still be part of the real exchange rate deviation at time  $t$ . Hence, we can say that shocks die out—or the real exchange rate reverts toward its mean of  $\tilde{q}$ —at the rate of  $(1 - \varphi)$  per period. (If the real exchange rate followed a random walk, then  $\varphi = 1$  and shocks would *never* die out.) Frankel's point

estimate of  $\varphi$  is 0.86, and he is able to reject the hypothesis of a random walk at the 5 percent level.

Similar results to Frankel's were obtained by Edison (1987), based on an analysis of data over the period 1890–1978, and by Glen (1992), using a data sample spanning the period 1900–1987. Lothian and Taylor (1996) use two centuries of data on dollar-sterling and franc-sterling real exchange rates, reject the random walk hypothesis and find point estimates of  $\varphi$  of 0.89 for dollar-sterling and of 0.76 for franc-sterling. Moreover, they are unable to detect any significant evidence of a structural break between the pre- and post-Bretton Woods period. Taylor (2002) extends the long-run analysis to a set of 20 countries over the 1870–1996 period and also finds support for PPP and coefficients that are stable in the long run. Studies such as these provide the formal counterpart to the informal evidence of long-run relative PPP like eyeballing Figure 1.

Another approach to providing a convincing test of real exchange rate stability, while limiting the timeframe to the post-Bretton Woods period, is to use more countries. By increasing the amount of information employed in the tests *across* exchange rates, the power of the test should be increased. In an early study of this type, Abuaf and Jorion (1990) examine a system of 10 first-order autoregressive regressions for real dollar exchange rates over the period 1973–1987, where the autocorrelation coefficient is constrained to be the same in every case. Their results indicate a marginal rejection of the null hypothesis of *joint* non-mean reversion at conventional significance levels, which they interpret this as evidence in favor of long-run PPP. An academic cottage industry sprang up in the 1990s to apply unit root tests to real exchange rate data on panels of countries for the post-Bretton Woods period. A number of these studies claimed to provide evidence supporting long-run PPP. Taylor and Sarno (1998), however, issued an important warning in interpreting these findings. The tests typically applied in these panel-data studies test the null hypothesis that *none* of the real exchange rates under consideration are mean reverting. If this null hypothesis is rejected, then the most that can be inferred is that *at least one* of the rates *is* mean reverting. However, researchers tended to draw a much stronger inference that *all* of the real exchange rates were mean reverting—and this broader inference is not valid. Some researchers have sought to remedy this shortcoming by designing alternative tests; for example, Taylor and Sarno (1998) suggest testing the hypothesis that at least one of real exchange rates is non-mean reverting, rejection of which would indeed imply that they are *all* mean reverting. However, such alternative tests are generally less powerful, so that their application has not led to clear-cut conclusions (Taylor and Sarno, 1998; Sarno and Taylor, 1998).

### PPP Puzzles

The research on the evolution of exchange rates from the 1970s to the turn of the century has generally been interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that exchange rates adjust to the PPP level in the long run. But the evidence is weak. For example, rejecting at standard levels of statistical significance the null hypothesis that a unit root exists certainly doesn't prove that a long-run PPP exchange rate

exists, either. The long-span studies raise the issue of possible regime shifts and whether the recent evidence may be swamped by history. The panel-data studies raise the issue of whether the hypothesis of non-mean reversion is being rejected because of just a few mean-reverting real exchange rates within the panel. If exchange rates do tend to converge to PPP, economists have—at least so far—had a hard time presenting strong evidence to support the claim. Following Taylor, Peel and Sarno (2001), we see the puzzling lack of strong evidence for long-run PPP—especially for the post-Bretton Woods period—as the first PPP puzzle.

A second related puzzle also exists. In the mid-1980s, Huizinga (1987) and others began to notice that even the studies that were interpreted as supporting the thesis that PPP holds in the long run also suggested that the speed at which real exchange rates adjust to the PPP exchange rate was extremely slow. A few years later, Rogoff (1996, p. 647) presented the puzzle this way: “The purchasing power parity puzzle then is this: How can one reconcile the enormous short-term volatility of real exchange rates with the extremely slow rate at which shocks appear to damp out?”

As we noted above, this speed is related to the estimated coefficient in the autoregressive process described earlier: a proportion of  $\varphi$  of any shock will still remain after one period,  $\varphi^2$  of it remains after two periods, and in general,  $\varphi^n$  of the shock will remain after  $n$  periods. One way to get a feel for how fast the real exchange rate mean reverts is by asking how long it would take for the effect of a shock to die out by 50 percent—in other words, we can compute the *half-life* of shocks to the real exchange rate.

Based on a reading of the panel unit root and long-span investigations of long-run PPP, Rogoff (1996) notes a high degree of consensus concerning the estimated half-lives of adjustment: they mostly tend to fall into the range of three to five years. Moreover, most such estimates were based on ordinary least squares methods, which may be biased because ordinary least squares will tend to push the estimated autocorrelation coefficient away from one to avoid nonstationarity; using different estimation methods to correct for bias, but still in a linear setting, some authors have argued that half-lives are even longer (for example, Murray and Papell, 2004; Chen and Engel, 2004). Now, although real shocks to tastes and technology might plausibly account for *some* of the observed high volatility in real exchange rates (Stockman, 1988), Rogoff argues that most of the slow speed of adjustment must be due to the persistence in *nominal* variables such as nominal wages and prices. But nominal variables would be expected to adjust much faster than a half-life of three to five years for exchange rates would suggest.

The apparently very slow speed of adjustment of real exchange rates—from 0 to about 10 percent or so per annum—has been the source of considerable theoretical and empirical research in recent years.

## Nonlinearity?

One approach to resolving the PPP puzzles lies in allowing for nonlinear dynamics in real exchange rate adjustment. In a linear framework, the adjustment

speed of PPP deviations from parity is assumed to be uniform at all times and, in particular, for all sizes of deviation, and implicitly the econometric problem is reduced to the estimation of a single parameter—the half-life. While this framework is very convenient, there are good reasons for suspecting that the speed of convergence toward the PPP exchange rate should be greater as the deviation from PPP rises in absolute value. Indeed, some 90 years ago, Heckscher (1916) suggested that adjustment may be nonlinear because of transactions costs in international arbitrage. For example, if two goods differ in price (expressed in a common currency) in different countries because PPP does not hold, it won't be worth arbitraging and therefore correcting the price difference unless the anticipated profit exceeds the cost of shipping goods between the two locations. This insight began to be expressed more formally in the theoretical literature starting in the late 1980s (for example, Benninga and Protopapadakis, 1988; Williams and Wright, 1991; Dumas, 1992). The qualitative effect of such frictions is similar in all of the proposed models: the lack of arbitrage arising from transactions costs such as shipping costs creates a “band of inaction” within which price dynamics in the two locations are essentially disconnected. Such transactions costs might take the form of the stylized “iceberg” shipping costs (“iceberg” because some of the goods effectively disappear when they are shipped and the transaction cost may also be proportional to the distance shipped), fixed costs of trading operations or of shipments or time lags for the delivery of goods from one location to another.

In empirical work on mean reversion in the real exchange rate, nonlinearity can be examined through the estimation of models that allow the autoregressive parameter to vary. For example, transactions costs of arbitrage may lead to changes in the real exchange rate being purely random until a threshold equal to the transactions cost is breached, when arbitrage takes place and the real exchange rate reverts back toward the band through the influence of goods arbitrage (although the return is not instantaneous because of shipping time, increasing marginal costs or other frictions). This kind of model is known as “threshold autoregressive.”

The model applies straightforwardly to individual commodities. Focusing on gold as foreign exchange, Canjels, Prakash-Canjels and Taylor (forthcoming) studied the classical gold standard using such a framework applied to daily data from 1879 to 1913; they found dollar-sterling exchange-rate adjustment consistent with a threshold autoregressive model. Examining subindices of the consumer price index, Obstfeld and Taylor (1997) modeled price adjustment in various international cities in the post-1973 period and also found significant nonlinearities. The implied transaction cost bands and adjustment speeds were also found to be of a reasonable size (consistent with direct shipping cost measures) and to vary systematically with impediments such as distance, tariffs, quotas and exchange-rate volatility. Sarno, Taylor and Chowdhury (2004) employ this approach with disaggregated data across a broad range of goods in the G-7 countries (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States). Zussman (2003) uses a threshold autoregressive model with the postwar Penn World Table data to show nonlinear adjustment speeds for a very wide sample of countries.

Using a threshold autoregressive model for real exchange rates as a whole,

however, could pose some conceptual difficulties. Transactions costs are likely to differ across goods, and so the speed at which price differentials are arbitrated may differ across goods (Cheung, Chinn and Fujii, 2001). Now, the *aggregate* real exchange rate is usually constructed as the nominal exchange rate multiplied by the ratio of national aggregate price level indices and so, instead of a single threshold barrier, a range of thresholds will be relevant, corresponding to the various transactions costs of the various goods whose prices are included in the indices. Some of these thresholds might be quite small (for example, because the goods are easy to ship) while others will be larger. As the real exchange rate moves further and further away from the level consistent with PPP, more and more of the transactions thresholds would be breached and so the effect of arbitrage would be increasingly felt. How might we address this type of aggregation problem? One way is to employ a well-developed class of econometric models that embody a kind of smooth but nonlinear adjustment such that the speed of adjustment increases as the real exchange rate moves further away from the level consistent with PPP.<sup>4</sup> Using a smooth version of a threshold autoregressive model, and data on real dollar exchange rates among the G-5 countries (France, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States), Taylor, Peel and Sarno (2001) reject the hypothesis of a unit root in favor of the alternative hypothesis of nonlinearly mean-reverting real exchange rates—and using data just for the post-Bretton Woods period, thus solving the first PPP puzzle. They also find that for modest real exchange shocks in the 1 to 5 percent range, the half-life of decay is under three years, while for larger shocks the half-life of adjustment is estimated much smaller—thus going some way toward solving the second PPP puzzle.

While transactions costs models have most often been advanced as possible sources of nonlinear adjustment, other less formal arguments for the presence of nonlinearities have also been advanced. Kilian and Taylor (2003), for example, suggest that nonlinearity may arise from the heterogeneity of opinion in the foreign exchange market concerning the equilibrium level of the nominal exchange rate: as the nominal rate takes on more extreme values, a greater degree of consensus develops concerning the appropriate *direction* of exchange rate moves, and traders act accordingly. Taylor (2004) argues that exchange rate nonlinearity may also arise from the intervention operations of central banks: intervention is more likely to occur and to be effective when the nominal—and hence the real—exchange rate has been driven a long distance away from its PPP or fundamental equilibrium.

In sum, the nonlinear approach to real exchange rate modeling offers some resolution of the PPP puzzles. Moreover, simulations show that if the true data are

<sup>4</sup> The smoothly adjusting extension of the threshold autoregressive or TAR model is the aptly named smooth-transition autoregressive, or STAR, model (Granger and Teräsvirta, 1993) and the exponential STAR or ESTAR has proved very successful in the application to real exchange rates (Michael, Nobay and Peel, 1997; Taylor and Peel, 2000). The ESTAR model can be thought of as a TAR with an infinite number of regimes and a continuously varying and bounded adjustment speed; Sarno and Taylor (2002) offer a textbook treatment. Alternative treatments of the goods-aggregation problem are currently being explored, but not without controversy (Imbs, Mumtaz, Ravn and Rey, 2002; Chen and Engel, 2004).



generated by a nonlinear process, but then a linear unit root or other linear autoregressive model is estimated, problems can easily arise. Standard unit root tests, already weak in power, are further enfeebled in this setting and half-lives can be dramatically exaggerated (Granger and Teräsvirta, 1993; Taylor, 2001; Taylor, Peel and Sarno, 2001).

The transactions-cost approach to real exchange rates is also generating influential intellectual spillovers into current research flourishing at the nexus of the two fields of international trade and international macroeconomics. The study of international trade has currently been enlivened by a new focus on the role of physical and other barriers, such as distance, remoteness, borders or various policies (Anderson and van Wincoop, 2004). International macroeconomists are also now making explicit the role of these trading frictions in new models where such refinements may yet help us solve some of the major puzzles in the field (Obstfeld and Rogoff, 2001; Betts and Kehoe, 2001; Bergin and Glick, 2003; Ghironi and Melitz, 2003).

## **Remaining Puzzles: Short-Run Disturbances, Long-Run Equilibrium**

Empirical work that focuses on the path of real exchange rates must grapple with three key factors: the reversion speed; the volatility of the disturbance term; and the long-run, or equilibrium, level of the real exchange rate. Most of our discussion to this point, in keeping with the focus of the literature, has pertained to the reversion speed, which is a medium-run phenomenon. But in the future, we expect to see more attention given to the disturbances, which are a short-run phenomenon measured over months and also to the very long run question of what is the equilibrium real exchange rate. Thus, questions about the real exchange rate are likely to shift—from not so much “how fast is it reverting?” to “how did it deviate in the first place?” and “what is it reverting to?”<sup>5</sup>

### **Exchange Rate Disturbances**

Even if current work can establish that exchange rates do revert to the PPP rate over the medium term at a more reasonable speed, the volatilities present in the data in the short run, at least under floating rate regimes, still cause considerable mystification. Over short periods, nominal exchange rates move substantially and prices do not, so real and nominal exchange rate volatilities in the short term are correlated almost one for one, and the Law of One Price for traded goods is often violated (Flood and Rose, 1995). This pattern holds across different monetary regime types over a wide swathe of historical experience (Taylor, 2002). Despite

<sup>5</sup> Of course, with reference to the PPP puzzle, the literature on *real* exchange rates has generally been focused on monthly or lower frequencies, since this is where price index data are available. There are plenty of *nominal* exchange rate puzzles at even higher frequency—weekly, daily, even intraday—but these are more properly in the domain of finance than international macroeconomics and are outside the scope of this survey.



efforts to explain such phenomena as a result of taste or technology shocks in flexible price models, it is implausible that the patterns could be traced wholly to real factors. History shows that volatilities also differ systematically across monetary regimes.<sup>6</sup> Instead, it is likely that some combination of monetary policy and price stickiness plays a role in the short-run volatility of exchange rates, mechanisms that could be amplified by other types of frictions.

Various new strands in the literature seek to address these issues. One common theme recognizes the important role of frictions in trade, not just for generating no-arbitrage bands for traded goods, but for delineating traded from nontraded varieties. Economies may be more closed than we once thought, since large sectors like retailing, wholesaling and distribution are nontraded—even if the price of imports as measured in official data typically includes some element of these domestic costs (Obstfeld, 2001; Obstfeld and Rogoff, 2001; Burstein, Neves and Rebelo, 2003).

In an economy with price stickiness and a nontraded sector, small monetary shocks can generate high levels of exchange rate volatility. For example, Burstein, Eichenbaum and Rebelo (2003) model a price sticky nontraded sector with a share of the economy well above 0.5, which yields a large devaluation response of an emerging market country even for a small monetary shock. When the nontraded share of the economy rises, the economy is less “open” and the Law of One Price assumption applies to a smaller fraction of goods (here, imported varieties), implying a larger role for exchange rate overshooting and other sources of exchange rate volatility (Obstfeld and Rogoff, 2000; Hau, 2000, 2002). Considerable future research remains to be done in this area to establish a general framework that will apply to a wide range of cases.

### **Long-Run Movements of the Real Exchange Rate**

The PPP exchange rate theory is built on the concept that the exchange rate is based on actual buying power over a basket of goods, and so changes in the nominal exchange rate should reflect changes in the price of goods—with the real exchange rate staying fixed. But a nation’s equilibrium real exchange rate may not remain fixed forever.

One of the textbook explanations for changes in the level of the real exchange rate focuses on the net international asset position. Consider a small, open economy in long-run equilibrium. Now impose a shock in the form of an increase in external debt. The country must run a trade surplus in the future to service the interest payments due. To encourage foreign consumers to import more, and to encourage its own consumers to import less, the country’s competitiveness must improve in equilibrium. With the nominal exchange rate defined as the domestic price of foreign currency, this means that the equilibrium level of the real exchange

<sup>6</sup> For example, it is hard to imagine that, say, the real shocks to the Argentine economy were small in the 1960s, suddenly became several times larger during the 1980s hyperinflations, then shrank again in the 1990s currency board epoch, only to mysteriously reappear in late 2001. But we do know that to a first approximation Argentina’s turbulent monetary history matches the observed volatilities very closely.

rate must rise, making the country's exports cheaper to foreigners and its foreign imports more expensive to domestic residents. This example supposes differentiated goods at home and abroad, but the logic holds in a wide range of models (like the portfolio balance model of Taylor, 1995; Sarno and Taylor, 2002b).

Lane and Milesi-Ferreti (2002) present some empirical confirmation of this argument. They find that countries with larger positive net asset positions have more negative trade balances *and* stronger real exchange rates, controlling for other factors and allowing for real return differentials across countries. This result has implications for the study of real exchange rate dynamics. If the equilibrium PPP exchange rate changes as a result of changes in net wealth, and if these shifts are not controlled for in an autoregression, then the exchange rate will appear to deviate from what is falsely assumed to be a fixed PPP rate for too much or for too long.

The other textbook story for trending real exchange rates is built around nontraded goods. Standard arbitrage arguments may lead PPP to hold for traded goods, but these arguments fail for nontraded goods, so that we must either abandon PPP theory, or else modify it. The Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson model of equilibrium real exchange rates is attracting renewed interest as a desirable modification after languishing for some years in relative obscurity (Harrod, 1933; Balassa, 1964; Samuelson, 1964).


In this model, rich countries supposedly grow rich by advancing productivity in traded "modern" sectors (say, manufacturing). Meantime, all nontraded "traditional" sectors, in rich and poor countries alike, remain in technological stasis (say, haircuts). Suppose the Law of One Price holds among traded goods and we live in a world where labor is mobile intersectorally, but not internationally. As productivity in the modern sector rises, wage levels rise, so prices of nontraded goods will have to rise (as there has been no rise in productivity in that sector). If we measure the overall price index as a weighted average of traded and nontraded goods prices, relatively rich countries will tend to have "overvalued" currencies. The example of fast-growing Japan springs to mind, where the trend real exchange rate has steadily appreciated by about 1.5 percent per year since 1880; the opposite trend has sometimes been observed in slow growth eras, for example, in Argentina (Taylor, 2002; Froot and Rogoff, 1995; Rogoff, 1996).

Early studies of the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect such as Officer (1982) found little support in the data from the 1950s to the early 1970s. But newer research dealing with later periods has often found support for this hypothesis, and it is now textbook material (for example, Micossi and Milesi-Ferreti, 1994; De Gregorio, Giovannini and Wolf, 1994; Chinn, 2000).

Why have more recent studies provided stronger evidence of the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect? At some level, the reasons reflect developments in the PPP literature more broadly: more data, of longer span, for a wider sample of countries, coupled with more powerful univariate and panel econometric techniques, has allowed researchers to take a once-fuzzy relationship in the data and make it tighter.

In addition, recent work suggests that the magnitude of the Harrod-Balassa-

Figure 3

**Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson Effects Emerge: Log Price Level versus Log Per Capita Income**

Notes: This figure shows countries' log price level (vertical axis) against log real income per capita for 1995, 1950 and 1913, with the United States used as the base country.

Samuelson effect has been variable over time—certainly in the postwar period and perhaps going back several centuries (Bergin, Glick and Taylor, 2004). Consider the relationships in Figure 3. The horizontal axis shows the per capita income level of countries as a ratio of the U.S. per capita income level, expressed in log terms. The vertical axis shows the common currency Penn World Table Consumer Price Index price level of other countries as a ratio of the U.S. CPI price level—that is, the real exchange rate level—again expressed as a log. (Note that most countries have incomes and price levels lower than the United States, so the ratios are less than one, and the logs are negative.) The Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson hypothesis suggests that as per capita income rises, driven by productivity growth in tradables, then price levels should also rise: there should be a positive correlation in the scatterplot. The graphs show that the cross-country relationship between income per capita and the price level has been intensifying since 1950; once close to zero, and statistically insignificant, the elasticity is now over one half. The null hypothesis of a zero slope can be rejected beginning in the early 1960s when Balassa and Samuelson wrote their seminal papers (albeit with no knowledge of these hypothesis tests).

It is not clear why the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect has altered over time. One possible explanation is that the nontraded share has increased over time, but this effect does not seem to have enough magnitude to match the changes that have occurred, nor to match the timing of the changes (remember that global trade in 1950, after world wars and depression, was a lower share of output than in 1913 or in 2000). Perhaps the productivity advances of traded and nontraded goods have differed at various times? This may better help us explain the data, but over long time frames begs the question of which goods are traded and why. Bergin, Glick and Taylor (2004) advance the hypothesis that trade costs determine tradability patterns, which allows a variety of possible productivity shocks to give rise eventually to an endogenous Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect.

But the key point here is that if the equilibrium exchange rate is moving gradually over time, and our statistical analysis presupposes that the PPP exchange rate is fixed over time, then estimates of the speed of reversion to the PPP will be biased. An allowance for such long-run trends can make a material difference in resolving the puzzles about whether and how fast the exchange rate moves to its PPP level. For example, Taylor (2002) finds relatively low half-lives in a 20-country panel when an allowance is made for long-run trends in the equilibrium exchange rate. Allowing for nonlinear time trends, Lothian and Taylor (2000) suggest that the half-life of deviations from PPP for the U.S.-UK exchange rate may be as low as  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years. Lothian and Taylor (2004) show that the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect may account for about a third of the variation in this real exchange rate.

The equilibrium real exchange rate could shift for a number of reasons over the very long run: wealth effects, productivity effects and other forces could all be important. Models that allow for a time-varying equilibrium real exchange rate, and permit an exploration of its causes and consequences, are likely to be a busy area for future research. Coordinated progress on these fronts will not only refine our resolution of the PPP puzzles, they will also help us address related puzzles in the macroeconomic literature. For example, Engel (1999, 2000) decomposed the variance of the real exchange rate into external traded goods prices and internal traded-versus-nontraded goods prices. The component related to external traded goods can be viewed as related to the Law of One Price in the basic version of the PPP theory where the real exchange rate is assumed to be fixed, while the component related to traded and nontraded goods can be related to the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect or any approach where the real exchange rate has a trend. In looking at post-Bretton Woods samples of data, Engel found that *both* of these components have persistence, but the Law of One Price component seems to experience larger shocks. The two insights may also be unified, as in recent models of endogenous tradability (Betts and Kehoe 2001; Bergin and Glick, 2003). The researcher can use nonlinear models with trade costs to understand the volatility related to traded goods—as Parsley and Wei (2003) do with the Engel puzzle—and then use some version of the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect to model and estimate the slower and often obscured drift in the prices of nontraded goods.

## Conclusion

Since the early 1970s, the purchasing power parity theory of exchange rates has been the subject of an ongoing and lively debate. For much of that period, theoretical work suggested that exchange rates should be linked to relative changes in price levels with deviations that might be only minimal or momentary, while empirical work could find only the flimsiest evidence in support of purchasing power parity, and even these weak findings implied an extremely slow rate of reversion to PPP of, at best, three to five years.

After a struggle to find common ground, the gap between theory and empirics is being closed from both directions. After early disappointments with dynamic

general equilibrium models, recent applications with nominal price rigidities show how monetary shocks may have large and long-lasting effects on the real exchange rate (Bergin and Feenstra, 2001). When such insights are combined with theoretical work on transactions costs and nonlinearity, we can now better understand the volatility and persistence of the real exchange rate. Going further, the presence of nontraded goods (a manifestation of extreme transaction costs) enriches our models further. A renewed attention to the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect and wealth effects leads to a modified view of PPP where the equilibrium real exchange rate itself may move over time.

The idea that transaction costs matter for PPP is an old one. For Hume (1742–1752 [1987]), goods arbitrage caused countervailing flows of specie, with the analogy that “all water, wherever it communicates, remains always at a level,” except that if markets are separated “by any material of physical impediment. . . there may, in such a case, be a very great inequality of money.” Heckscher (1916) developed the idea further, introducing the concept of “commodity points.” Keynes (1923, pp. 89–90, 91–92) highlighted transaction costs as a key substantive issue for the PPP theory:

At first sight this theory appears to be one of great practical utility. . . . In practical applications of the doctrine there are, however, two further difficulties, which we have allowed so far to escape our attention,—both of them arising out of the words *allowance being made for transport charges and imports and export taxes*. The first difficulty is how to make allowance for such charges and taxes. The second difficulty is how to treat purchasing power of goods and service which *do not enter into international trade at all*. . . . For, if we restrict ourselves to articles entering into international trade and make exact allowance for transport and tariff costs, we should find that the theory is always in accordance with the facts. . . . In fact, the theory, stated thus, is a truism, and as nearly as possible jejune.

As these venerable ideas start to be incorporated into formal theory and empirics—in particular, via nonlinear adjustment—results are suggesting more strongly that exchange rates do revert to a certain level determined by the price level in the long run and that the half-life of this reversion is short enough, at perhaps one to three years for moderately sized shocks of more than 1 or 2 percent, to seem theoretically plausible.

Several new directions could now be taken. A very general theoretical model could be developed to incorporate all of the above refinements simultaneously and its predictions studied. Empiricists could attempt to include both nonlinearities and Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effects to get even tighter estimates of convergence speeds. Introducing trade costs and real shocks into a Clarida and Galí (1994) decomposition might advance the potential for reconciliation even further.

In sum, however, our interpretation of the consensus view of the PPP debate—that short-run PPP does not hold, that long-run PPP may hold in the sense that there is significant mean reversion of the real exchange rate, although there may

be factors impinging on the equilibrium real exchange rate through time—is highly reminiscent of the consensus view that held sway in the period before the 1970s. In that sense, this paper may be taken as evidence of mean reversion in economic thought.

■ *For their helpful comments we thank, without implicating, Menzie Chinn, Richard Clarida, Bradford DeLong, Charles Engel, Jeffrey Frankel, James Hines, James Lothian, Bennett McCallum, Michael Melvin, Peter Neary, Maurice Obstfeld, Lawrence Officer, David Papell, David Peel, Phillip Lane, Kenneth Rogoff, Andrew Rose, Lucio Sarno, Timothy Taylor, Eric van Wincoop and Michael Waldman.*

## References

- Abuaf, Niso and Philippe Jorion.** 1990. "Purchasing Power Parity in the Long Run." *Journal of Finance*. 45:1, pp. 157–74.
- Adler, Michael and Bruce Lehmann.** 1983. "Deviations from Purchasing Power Parity in the Long Run." *Journal of Finance*. 38:5, pp. 1471–487.
- Anderson, James E. and Eric van Wincoop.** 2004. "Trade Costs." *Journal of Economic Literature*. 42:3, pp. 691–751.
- Balassa, Bela.** 1964. "The Purchasing-Power Parity Doctrine: A Reappraisal." *Journal of Political Economy*. 72:6, pp. 584–96.
- Benninga, Simon and Aris A. Protopapadakis.** 1988. "The Equilibrium Pricing of Exchange Rates and Assets When Trade Takes Time." *Journal of International Economics*. 7:2, pp. 129–49.
- Bergin, Paul R. and Robert C. Feenstra.** 2001. "Pricing-to-Market, Staggered Contracts, and Real Exchange Rate Persistence." *Journal of International Economics*. 54:2, pp. 333–59.
- Bergin, Paul R. and Reuven Glick.** 2003. "Endogenous Nontradability and Macroeconomic Implications." Working Paper Series No. 9739, National Bureau of Economic Research, June.
- Bergin, Paul R., Reuven Glick and Alan M. Taylor.** 2004. "Productivity, Tradability, and the Long-Run Price Puzzle." Working Paper Series No. 10569, National Bureau of Economic Research, June.
- Betts, Caroline M. and Timothy J. Kehoe.** 2001. "Tradability of Goods and Real Exchange Rate Fluctuations." University of Southern California.
- Burstein, Ariel, Martin Eichenbaum and Sergio Rebelo.** 2003. "Large Devaluations and the Real Exchange Rate." Photocopy, Northwestern University, September.
- Burstein, Ariel, João Neves, and Sergio Rebelo.** 2003. "Distribution Costs and Real Exchange Rate Dynamics." *Journal of Monetary Economics*. 50:6, pp. 1189–214.
- Canjels, Eugene, Gauri Prakash-Canjels and Alan M. Taylor.** 2004. "Measuring Market Integration: Foreign Exchange Arbitrage and the Gold Standard, 1879–1913." *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 86:4.
- Cassel, Gustav.** 1918. "Abnormal Deviations in International Exchanges." *Economic Journal*. December, 28, pp. 413–15.
- Cassel, Gustav.** 1922. *Money and Foreign Exchange After 1914*. New York: Macmillan.
- Chen, Shiu-Sheng and Charles Engel.** 2004. "Does 'Aggregation Bias' Explain the PPP Puzzle?" Working Paper Series No. 10304, National Bureau of Economic Research, February.
- Cheung, Yin-Wong, Menzie Chinn and Eiji Fujii.** 2001. "Market Structure and the Persistence of Sectoral Real Exchange Rates." *International Journal of Finance and Economics*. 6:2, pp. 95–114.
- Chinn, Menzie D.** 2000. "The Usual Suspects? Productivity and Demand Shocks and Asia-Pacific Real Exchange Rates." *Review of International Economics*. 8:1, pp. 20–43.
- Clarida, Richard and Jordi Galí.** 1994. "Sources of Real Exchange rate Fluctuations: How Important are Nominal Shocks?" *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*. 41, pp. 1–55.
- Coakley, Jerry, Robert Flood, Ana-Maria**



- Fuertes and Mark P. Taylor.** 2004. "Long-Run Purchasing Power Parity and the Theory of General Relativity: the First Tests." Photocopy, University of Warwick. *Journal of International Money and Finance*. Forthcoming.
- Corbae, P. Dean and Sam Ouliaris.** 1988. "Cointegration and Tests of Purchasing Power Parity." *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 70:3, pp. 508–11.
- Cumby, Robert E. and Maurice Obstfeld.** 1984. "International Interest Rate and Price Level Linkages under Flexible Exchange Rates: A Review of Recent Evidence," in *Exchange Rate Theory and Practice*. John F. O. Bilson and Richard C. Marston, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 121–51.
- Davutyan, Nurhan and John Pippenger.** 1990. "Testing Purchasing Power Parity: Some Evidence of the Effects of Transaction Costs." *Econometric Reviews*. 9:2, pp. 211–40.
- De Grauwe, Paul, Marc Janssens and Hilde Leliaert.** 1985. *Real Exchange-Rate Variability from 1920 to 1926 and 1973 to 1982*. Princeton: Princeton Studies in International Finance.
- De Gregorio, Jose and Holger C. Wolf.** 1994. "Terms of Trade, Productivity, and the Real Exchange Rate." Working Paper Series No. 4807, National Bureau of Economic Research, July.
- De Gregorio, Jose, Alberto Giovannini and Holger C. Wolf.** 1994. "International Evidence on Tradable and Nontradables Inflation." *European Economic Review*. 38:6, pp. 1225–244.
- Dornbusch, Rudiger.** 1976. "Expectations and Exchange Rate Dynamics." *Journal of Political Economy*. 84:6, pp. 1161–176.
- Dornbusch, Rudiger and Paul Krugman.** 1976. "Flexible Exchange Rates in the Short Run." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*. 1:3, pp. 537–75.
- Dumas, Bernard.** 1992. "Dynamic Equilibrium and the Real Exchange Rate in a Spatially Separated World." *Review of Financial Studies*. 5:2, pp. 153–80.
- Edison, Hali J.** 1987. "Purchasing Power Parity in the Long Run: A Test of the Dollar/Pound Exchange Rate, 1890–1978." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*. 19:3, pp. 376–87.
- Engel, Charles.** 1999. "Accounting for U.S. Real Exchange Rate Changes." *Journal of Political Economy*. 107:3, pp. 507–38.
- Engel, Charles.** 2000. "Long-Run PPP May Not Hold After All." *Journal of International Economics*. 51:2, pp. 243–73.
- Engle, Robert and Clive W. J. Granger.** 1987. "Co-integration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing." *Econometrica*. 55:2, pp. 251–76.
- Flood, Robert P. and Andrew K. Rose.** 1995. "Fixing Exchange Rates: A Virtual Quest for Fundamentals." *Journal of Monetary Economics*. 36:1, pp. 3–37.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A.** 1986. "International Capital Mobility and Crowding-out in the U.S. Economy: Imperfect Integration of Financial Markets or of Goods Markets?" in *How Open is the U.S. Economy?* R. W. Hafer, ed. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, pp. 33–67.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A.** 1990. "Zen and the Art of Modern Macroeconomics: A Commentary," in *Monetary Policy for a Volatile Global Economy*. W. S. Haraf and T. D. Willett, eds. Washington, D.C.: AEI Press, pp. 117–23.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A. and Andrew K. Rose.** 1995. "Empirical Research on Nominal Exchange Rates," in *Handbook of International Economics, Volume 3*. G. Grossman and K. Rogoff, eds. Amsterdam, New York and Oxford: Elsevier, North-Holland, chapter 33.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A. and Andrew K. Rose.** 1996. "A Panel Project on Purchasing Power Parity: Mean Reversion Within and Between Countries." *Journal of International Economics*. 40:1–2, pp. 209–24.
- Frenkel, Jacob A.** 1976. "A Monetary Approach to the Exchange Rate: Doctrinal Aspects and Empirical Evidence." *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*. 78:2, pp. 200–24.
- Frenkel, Jacob A.** 1981. "The Collapse of Purchasing Power Parity During the 1970s." *European Economic Review*. 16:1, pp. 145–65.
- Frenkel, Jacob A. and Harry G. Johnson.** 1976. *The Monetary Approach to the Balance of Payments*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Froot, Kenneth A. and Kenneth Rogoff.** 1995. "Perspectives on PPP and Long-Run Real Exchange Rates," in *Handbook of International Economics*. G. Grossman and K. Rogoff, eds. Amsterdam: North Holland, pp. 1647–688.
- Glen, Jack D.** 1992. "Real Exchange Rates in the Short, Medium, and Long Run." *Journal of International Economics*. 33:1–2, pp. 147–66.
- Granger, Clive W. J. and Timo Teräsvirta.** 1993. *Modelling Nonlinear Economic Relationships*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrod, Roy.** 1933. *International Economics*. London: Nisbet and Cambridge University Press.
- Hau, Harald.** 2000. "Exchange Rate Determination under Factor Price Rigidities." *Journal of International Economics*. 50:2, pp. 421–47.
- Hau, Harald.** 2002. "Real Exchange Rate Volatility and Economic Openness: Theory and Evidence." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*. 34:3, pp. 611–30.
- Heckscher, Eli F.** 1916. "Växelkursens grundval vid pappersmynt." *Economisk Tidskrift*. 18, pp. 309–12.



- Hsieh, David.** 1982. "The Determination of the Real Exchange Rate: The Productivity Approach." *Journal of International Economics*. May, 12, pp. 355–62.
- Huizinga, John.** 1987. "An Empirical Investigation of the Long-Run Behavior of Real Exchange Rates." *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*. 27, pp. 149–215.
- Hume, David.** 1742–1752 [1987]. *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*. Indianapolis, Ind.: The Liberty Fund.
- Imbs, Jean, Haroon Mumtaz, Morten Ravn and Hélène Rey.** 2002. "PPP Strikes Back: Aggregation and the Real Exchange Rate." Working Paper Series No. 9372, National Bureau of Economic Research, December, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, forthcoming.
- Ito, Takatoshi, Peter Isard and Steven Symansky.** 1999. "Economic Growth and Real Exchange Rate: An Overview of the Balassa-Samuelson Hypothesis in Asia," in *Changes in Exchange Rates in Rapidly Developing Countries: Theory, Practice, and Policy Issues*. T. Ito and A. O. Krueger, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 109–28.
- Keynes, John Maynard.** 1923. *A Tract on Monetary Reform*. London: Macmillan.
- Kilian, Lutz and Mark P. Taylor.** 2003. "Why is it So Difficult to Beat the Random Walk Forecast of Exchange Rates?" *Journal of International Economics*. 60:1, pp. 85–107.
- Lane, Philip and Gian Maria Milesi-Ferretti.** 2002. "External Wealth, the Trade Balance and the Real Exchange Rate." *European Economic Review*. 46:6, pp. 1049–071.
- Lothian, James R.** 1990. "A Century Plus of Japanese Exchange Rate Behavior." *Japan and the World Economy*. February/March, 2, pp. 47–50.
- Lothian, James R. and Mark P. Taylor.** 1996. "Real Exchange Rate Behavior: The Recent Float from the Perspective of the Past Two Centuries." *Journal of Political Economy*. 104:3, pp. 488–509.
- Lothian, James R. and Mark P. Taylor.** 1997. "Real Exchange Rate Behavior: The Problem of Power and Sample Size." *Journal of International Money and Finance*. 16:6, pp. 945–54.
- Lothian, James R. and Mark P. Taylor.** 2004. "Real Exchange Rates, Nonlinearity and Relative Productivity: The Long and the Short of It." Photocopy, University of Warwick.
- Mark, Nelson.** 1990. "Real and Nominal Exchange Rates in the Long Run: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of International Economics*. 28:1-2, pp. 115–36.
- Michael, Panos, A. Robert Nobay and David A. Peel.** 1997. "Transaction Costs and Nonlinear Adjustment in Real Exchange Rates: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Political Economy*. 105:4, pp. 862–79.
- Micossi, Stefano and Gian Maria Milesi-Ferretti.** 1994. "Real Exchange Rates and the Prices of Nontradable Goods." Working Papers No. 94/19, International Monetary Fund.
- Murray, Christian J. and David H. Papell.** 2004. "The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle is Worse Than You Think." Photocopy, University of Houston, January.
- Obstfeld, Maurice.** 2001. "International Macroeconomics: Beyond the Mundell-Fleming Model" *IMF Staff Papers*. Special Issue, 47, pp. 1–39.
- Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff.** 2000. "The Six Major Puzzles in International Macroeconomics: Is There a Common Cause?" *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2000*. 115:1, pp. 339–90.
- Obstfeld, Maurice and Alan M. Taylor.** 1997. "Nonlinear Aspects of Goods-Market Arbitrage and Adjustment: Heckscher's Commodity Points Revisited." *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies*. 11:4, pp. 441–79.
- Obstfeld, Maurice and Alan M. Taylor.** 2004. *Global Capital Markets: Integration, Crisis, and Growth*. Japan-U.S. Center Sanwa Monographs on International Financial Markets Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connell, Paul G. J. and Shang-Jin Wei.** 2002. "The Bigger They are, the Harder They Fall: Retail Price Differences Across U.S. Cities." *Journal of International Economics*. 56:1, pp. 21–53.
- Officer, Lawrence H.** 1982. *Purchasing Power Parity and Exchange Rates: Theory, Evidence and Relevance*. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Papell, David H.** 1997. "Searching for Stationarity: Purchasing Power Parity Under the Current Float." *Journal of International Economics*. 43:3-4, pp. 313–32.
- Parsley, David C. and Shang-Jin Wei.** 2003. "A Prism into the PPP Puzzles: The Micro-Foundations of Big Mac Real Exchange Rates." Working Paper Series No. 10074, National Bureau of Economic Research, November.
- Redding, Stephen and Anthony J. Venables.** 2001. "Economic Geography and International Inequality." Discussion Paper No. 0495, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, May.
- Rogoff, Kenneth.** 1996. "The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle." *Journal of Economic Literature*. 34:2, pp. 647–68.
- Roll, Richard.** 1979. "Violations of Purchasing Power Parity and their Implications for Efficient International Commodity Markets," in *International Finance and Trade, Volume 1*. M. Sarnat and

G.P. Szego, eds. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, pp. 133–76.

**Samuelson, Paul A.** 1964. "Theoretical Notes on Trade Problems." *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 46:2, pp. 145–54.

**Sarno, Lucio and Mark P. Taylor.** 2002a. "Purchasing Power Parity and the Real Exchange Rate." *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers*. 49:1, pp. 65–105.

**Sarno, Lucio and Mark P. Taylor.** 2002b. *The Economics of Exchange Rates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Sarno, Lucio, Ibrahim Chowdhury and Mark P. Taylor.** 2004. "Non-Linear Dynamics in Deviations from the Law of One Price: A Broad-Based Empirical Study." *Journal of International Money and Finance*. 23:1, pp. 1–25.

**Sercu, Piet, Raman Uppal and Cynthia Van Hulle.** 1995. "The Exchange Rate in the Presence of Transaction Costs: Implications for Tests of Purchasing Power Parity." *Journal of Finance*. 50, pp. 1309–319.

**Shiller, Robert J. and Pierre Perron.** 1985. "Testing the Random Walk Hypothesis: Power Versus Frequency of Observation." *Economics Letters*. 18:4, pp. 381–86.

**Stockman, Alan C.** 1987. "The Equilibrium Approach to Exchange Rates." *Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond Economic Review*. 73:2, pp. 12–30.

**Stockman, Alan C.** 1988. "Real Exchange Rate Variability under Pegged and Floating Nominal Exchange Rate Systems: An Equilibrium Theory." *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*. 29, pp. 259–94.

**Taylor, Alan M.** 2001. "Potential Pitfalls for the Purchasing-Power Parity Puzzle? Sampling and Specification Biases in Mean-Reversion Tests of the Law of One Price." *Econometrica*. 69:2, pp. 473–98.

**Taylor, Alan M.** 2002. "A Century of Purchasing Power Parity." *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 84:1, pp. 139–50.

**Taylor, Mark P.** 1988. "An Empirical Examination of Long-Run Purchasing Power Parity Using Cointegration Techniques." *Applied Economics*. 20:10, pp. 1369–381.

**Taylor, Mark P.** 1995. "The Economics of Exchange Rates." *Journal of Economic Literature*. 33:1, pp. 13–47.

**Taylor, Mark P.** 2004. "Is Official Exchange Rate Intervention Effective?" *Economica*. 71:1, pp. 1–12.

**Taylor, Mark P. and Patrick C. McMahon.** 1988. "Long-Run Purchasing Power Parity in the 1920s." *European Economic Review*. 32:1, pp. 179–97.

**Taylor, Mark P. and Lucio Sarno.** 1998. "The Behavior of Real Exchange Rates During the Post-Bretton Woods Period." *Journal of International Economics*. 46:2, pp. 281–312.

**Taylor, Mark P. and Lucio Sarno.** 2004. "International Real Interest Rate Differentials, Purchasing Power Parity and the Behaviour of Real Exchange Rates: The Resolution of a Conundrum." *International Journal of Finance and Economics*. 9:1, pp. 15–23.

**Taylor, Mark P., David A. Peel and Lucio Sarno.** 2001. "Nonlinear Mean-Reversion in Real Exchange Rates: Towards a Solution to the Purchasing Power Parity Puzzles." *International Economic Review*. 42:4, pp. 1015–042.

**Williams, Jeffrey C. and Brian D. Wright.** 1991. *Storage and Commodity Markets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Zussman, Asaf.** 2003. "The Limits of Arbitrage: Trading Frictions and Deviations from Purchasing Power Parity." SIEPR Policy Paper No. 02-012.

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Michele Ca' Zorzi, Michał Rubaszek. 2020. Exchange rate forecasting on a napkin. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **104**, 102168. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Wei Opie, Steven J. Riddiough. 2020. Global currency hedging with common risk factors. *Journal of Financial Economics* **136**:3, 780-805. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Show-Lin Chen, Jyh-Lin Wu. 2020. Revisiting the persistence of real exchange rates. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **103**, 102133. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Yorgos D. Marinakis, Reilly White, Steven T. Walsh. 2020. Lotka–Volterra signals in ASEAN currency exchange rates. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **545**, 123743. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Justin Stoler, Amber L. Pearson, Chad Staddon, Amber Wutich, Elizabeth Mack, Alexandra Brewis, Asher Y. Rosinger, Ellis Adams, Jam Farooq Ahmed, Mallika Alexander, Mobolanle Balogun, Michael Boivin, Genny Carrillo, Kelly Chapman, Stroma Cole, Shalean M. Collins, Jorge Escobar-Vargas, Matthew Freeman, Gershim Asiki, Hala Ghattas, Ashley Hagaman, Zeina Jamaluddine, Wendy Jepson, Kenneth Maes, Jyoti Mathad, Patrick Mbullo, Hugo Melgar-Quinonez, Joshua Miller, Monet Niesluchowski, Nasrin Omidvar, Luisa Samayoa-Figueroa, E. Cuauhtemoc Sánchez-Rodríguez, Marianne V. Santoso, Roseanne C. Schuster, Andrea Sullivan, Yihenew Tesfaye, Nathaly Triviño, Alex Trowell, Desire Tshala-Katumbay, Raymond A. Tutu, Sera L. Young, Hassan Zinab. 2020. Cash water expenditures are associated with household water insecurity, food insecurity, and perceived stress in study sites across 20 low- and middle-income countries. *Science of The Total Environment* **716**, 135881. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang, Farhang Niroomand, Omid Ranjbar. 2020. Fourier nonlinear quantile unit root test and PPP in africa. *Bulletin of Economic Research* **30**. . [[Crossref](#)]
7. Yang Yang, Zhao Zhao. 2020. Quantile nonlinear unit root test with covariates and an application to the PPP hypothesis. *Economic Modelling* . [[Crossref](#)]
8. Dinçer Afat, Michael Frömmel. 2019. An Alternative Version of Purchasing Power Parity. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
9. Jong Cheol Yoon, Dai Hong Min, Sang Young Jei. 2019. Purchasing power parity vs. uncovered interest rate parity for NAFTA countries: The value of incorporating time-varying parameter model. *Economic Modelling* . [[Crossref](#)]
10. João P Romero. 2019. A Kaldor–Schumpeter model of cumulative growth. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **43**:6, 1597-1621. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Kai-Hua Wang, Chi-Wei Su, Ran Tao, Hsu-Ling Chang. 2019. Does the Efficient Market Hypothesis Fit Military Enterprises in China?. *Defence and Peace Economics* **30**:7, 877-889. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Emmanuel Kwasi Mensah, Lawrence Adu Asamoah, Johnson Worlanyo Ahiadorme. 2019. On the impact of exchange rate uncertainty on private investment in Ghana. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **8**. . [[Crossref](#)]
13. Vinh Q.T. Dang, Erin P.K. So, Alan Yu Yang, Kenneth S. Chan. 2019. China and international market integration: Evidence from the law of one price in the Middle East and Africa. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* 101127. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Faruk Mike, Oktay Kızılkaya. 2019. Testing the theory of PPP for emerging market economies that practice flexible exchange rate regimes. *Applied Economics Letters* **26**:17, 1411-1417. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Michael Curran, Adnan Velic. 2019. Real exchange rate persistence and country characteristics: A global analysis. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **97**, 35-56. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Collin Constantine. 2019. A Community Divided: Top Incomes in CARICOM Member States. *The European Journal of Development Research* **27**. . [[Crossref](#)]

17. Tie-Ying Liu, Chi-Wei Su, Ran Tao, Han Cong. 2019. Better is the Neighbor?. *Defence and Peace Economics* **30**:6, 706-718. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Burçak Müge Tunaer Vural. 2019. Determinants of Turkish real effective exchange rates. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* **73**, 151-158. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Murat Doğanlar, Oktay Kızılkaya, Faruk Mike. 2019. Testing the long-run PPP for Turkey: new evidence from the Fourier quantile unit root test. *Applied Economics Letters* 1-7. [[Crossref](#)]
20. William Miles. 2019. Home prices and fundamentals: solving the mystery for the G-7 by accounting for nonlinearities. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* **13**:2, 299-315. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Ibrahim Jamali, Ehab Yamani. 2019. Out-of-sample exchange rate predictability in emerging markets: Fundamentals versus technical analysis. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* **61**, 241-263. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Tomoyuki Takura, Nozomi Ebata-Kogure, Yoichi Goto, Masahiro Kohzuki, Masatoshi Nagayama, Keiko Oikawa, Teruyuki Koyama, Haruki Itoh. 2019. Cost-Effectiveness of Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients with Coronary Artery Disease: A Meta-Analysis. *Cardiology Research and Practice* **2019**, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Yamin Ahmad, Ming Chien Lo, Olena Staveley-O'Carroll. 2019. Nonlinearities in the real exchange rates: new evidence from developed and developing countries. *Applied Economics* **51**:25, 2731-2743. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Zixiong Xie, Shyh-Wei Chen. 2019. Exchange rates and fundamentals: A bootstrap panel data analysis. *Economic Modelling* **78**, 209-224. [[Crossref](#)]
25. Jong Cheol Yoon, Dai Hong Min, Sang Young Jei. 2019. Empirical test of purchasing power parity using a time-varying cointegration model for China and the UK. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **521**, 41-47. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Tobias Rötheli. 2019. Heuristics versus econometrics as a basis for forecasting international inflation differentials. *Foresight* **21**:2, 216-226. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Thomas J. O'Brien, Santiago Ruiz de Vargas. 2019. Currency indexes and consistent currency misvaluation: Illustrations using Big Mac data. *Research in International Business and Finance* **48**, 464-474. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Jason R. Reed. 2019. The forward premium puzzle and Markov-switching adaptive learning,. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **59**, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Jörg Mahlich, Jörn Sindern, Moritz Suppliet. 2019. Cross-national drug price comparisons with economic weights in external reference pricing in Germany. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research* **19**:1, 37-43. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Ladislava Issever Grochová, Klára Plecitá. Validity of the purchasing power parity theory in the euro area 400005. [[Crossref](#)]
31. William Miles. 2019. House Price Convergence in the Euro Zone: A Pairwise Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
32. Florian Mair, Alexander Thoma. 2019. What Flows Around Comes Around: Mean Reversion and Portfolio Flows. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
33. S. M. Woahid Murad, Mohammad Amzad Hossain. 2018. The ASEAN experience of the purchasing power parity theory. *Financial Innovation* **4**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
34. Anupa Rijal, Tara Ballav Adhikari, Jahangir A. M. Khan, Gabriele Berg-Beckhoff. 2018. The economic impact of non-communicable diseases among households in South Asia and their coping strategy: A systematic review. *PLOS ONE* **13**:11, e0205745. [[Crossref](#)]
35. MORTEN JERVEN. 2018. THE HISTORY OF AFRICAN POVERTY BY NUMBERS: EVIDENCE AND VANTAGE POINTS. *The Journal of African History* **59**:3, 449-461. [[Crossref](#)]

36. Mohamed Ariff, Alireza Zarei. 2018. Sustainable Development and Currency Exchange Rate Behavior. *Asian Economic Papers* 17:3, 148-173. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Jean-François L'Her, Tarek Masmoudi, Ram Karthik Krishnamoorthy. 2018. Net Buybacks and the Seven Dwarfs. *Financial Analysts Journal* 74:4, 57-85. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Burak Güriş, Muhammed Tıraşoğlu. 2018. The Validity of Purchasing Power Parity in BRICS Countries. *Prague Economic Papers* 27:4, 417-426. [[Crossref](#)]
39. Maria Eleftheriou, Nikolas A. Müller-Plantenberg. 2018. The Purchasing Power Parity Fallacy: Time to Reconsider the PPP Hypothesis. *Open Economies Review* 29:3, 481-515. [[Crossref](#)]
40. Robert Grafstein. 2018. The problem of polarization. *Public Choice* 176:1-2, 315-340. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Joseph T Salerno, Carmen Elena Dorobat. 2018. Currency depreciation and the monetary adjustment process: reconsidering Lord King's contributions. *Oxford Economic Papers* 70:3, 699-718. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Emiliano Libman. 2018. Endogenous norms in wage and price setting and hysteresis in the real exchange rate. *Metroeconomica* 69:3, 546-565. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Harun Kaya, İsmail ÇELİK. 2018. TÜRKİYE'DE SATIN ALMA GÜCÜ PARİTESİ HİPOTEZİNİN GEÇERLİLİĞİ: UZUN HAFIZA TESTLERİNDEN KANITLAR. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* . [[Crossref](#)]
44. Pablo Gabriel Bortz, Gabriel Michelená, Fernando Toledo. 2018. Foreign debt, conflicting claims and income policies in a Kaleckian model of growth and distribution. *Journal of Globalization and Development* 9:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
45. Luis F. Martins. 2018. Bootstrap tests for time varying cointegration. *Econometric Reviews* 37:5, 466-483. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsung-Pao Wu. 2018. PPP in the 34 OECD countries: evidence from quantile-based unit root tests with both smooth and sharp breaks. *Applied Economics* 50:23, 2622-2634. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Mulatu F. Zerihun, Marthinus C. Breitenbach. 2018. Is SADC an optimal currency area? Evidence from the generalized purchasing power parity test. *Economic Change and Restructuring* 51:2, 173-188. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Elano Ferreira Arruda, Ivan Castelar, Daniel Barboza Guimarães, Rafael Barros Barbosa. 2018. Price convergence, reversal speed and purchasing power parity: Stylized facts for Brazilian cities. *Economía* 19:2, 219-235. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Kenneth Clements, Yihui Lan, Jiawei Si. 2018. Uncertainty in currency mispricing. *Applied Economics* 50:20, 2297-2312. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Josh R. Stillwagon. 2018. ARE RISK PREMIA RELATED TO REAL EXCHANGE RATE SWINGS? EVIDENCE FROM I (2) CVARs WITH SURVEY EXPECTATIONS. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 22:2, 255-278. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Maria Eleftheriou, Nikolas A. Müller-Plantenberg. 2018. Price level convergence and purchasing power divergence. *International Finance* 21:1, 71-91. [[Crossref](#)]
52. Ernesto León-Castro, Ezequiel Avilés-Ochoa, José M. Merigó, Anna M. Gil-Lafuente. 2018. Heavy Moving Averages and Their Application in Econometric Forecasting. *Cybernetics and Systems* 49:1, 26-43. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Emiliano Libman. 2018. The effects of exchange rate regimes on real exchange rate misalignment. *International Review of Applied Economics* 32:1, 39-61. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Ezequiel Avilés Ochoa, Ernesto León Castro, Ana María Gil Lafuente, José María Merigo Lindahl. Forgotten Effects in Exchange Rate Forecasting Models 423-437. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Vassili Joannidès de Lautour. Internationalisation and Management Control Systems 49-90. [[Crossref](#)]



56. Tie-Ying Liu, Chi-Wei Su, Hsu-Ling Chang, De-Ping Xiong. 2018. Does the Law of One Price hold? A cross-regional study of China. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja* **31**:1, 592-606. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Vinh Q. T. Dang, Yu Alan Yang, Kenneth S. Chan. 2018. Yen or Yuan? The law of one price and economic integration in Asia. *The World Economy* **41**:1, 171-193. [[Crossref](#)]
58. Stephan Kranner. 2018. Currency Risk Premia in Emerging Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
59. Tim Glaus, Alexander Thoma. 2018. Mean Reversion Properties in Real Effective Exchange Rates. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
60. Álvaro Martín Moreno Rivas. 2018. La Conjetura De Shaikh. Un Modelo Clásico De La Tasa De Cambio Real Colombia-Estados Unidos (The Conjecture of Shaikh. A Classic Model of the Real Exchange Rate Colombia-United States). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
61. César Calderón, Megumi Kubota. 2018. Does higher openness cause more real exchange rate volatility?. *Journal of International Economics* **110**, 176-204. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Kyoung Jin Choi, Alfred Lehar, Ryan Stauffer. 2018. Bitcoin Microstructure and the Kimchi Premium. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
63. Axel Grossmann, Thanh Ngo, Marc W. Simpson. 2017. The asymmetric impact of currency purchasing power imparities on ADR mispricing. *Journal of Multinational Financial Management* **42-43**, 74-94. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Adrian R. Bell, Chris Brooks, Tony K. Moore. 2017. Did Purchasing Power Parity Hold in Medieval Europe?. *The Manchester School* **85**:6, 682-709. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Tack Yun. 2017. Natural Exchange Rate and Its Implications for the Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* **53**:11, 2397-2418. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Hongfeng Peng, Zhijie Liu, Tsangyao Chang. 2017. Revisiting purchasing power parity in BRICS countries using more powerful quantile unit-root tests with stationary covariates. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods* **46**:20, 10051-10057. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Axel Grossmann, Chris Paul, Marc W. Simpson. 2017. The impact of exchange rate deviations from relative PPP equilibrium on the U.S. demand for foreign equities. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **77**, 57-76. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Vinh Q. T. Dang, Yu Alan Yang. 2017. Assessing Market Integration in ASEAN with Retail Price Data. *Pacific Economic Review* **22**:4, 510-532. [[Crossref](#)]
69. Eu Joon Chang, Young Se Kim. 2017. Regional Relative Price Disparities and Their Driving Forces. *East Asian Economic Review* **21**:3, 201-230. [[Crossref](#)]
70. Leonardo Salazar. 2017. Modeling Real Exchange Rate Persistence in Chile. *Econometrics* **5**:3, 29. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Chi-Young Choi, Anthony Murphy, Jyh-Lin Wu. 2017. Segmentation of consumer markets in the US: What do intercity price differences tell us?. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **50**:3, 738-777. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Charles Yuji Horioka, Nicholas Ford. 2017. A possible explanation of the 'Exchange Rate Disconnect Puzzle': a common solution to three macroeconomic puzzles?. *Applied Economics Letters* **24**:13, 918-922. [[Crossref](#)]
73. Axel Grossmann, Chris Paul, Marc W. Simpson. 2017. An evaluation of the equilibrium value of the euro, its predecessors and their constituent currencies based on economic fundamentals. *Applied Economics* **49**:33, 3280-3312. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Duy Hung Bui, Anthony J Makin, Shyama Ratnasiri. 2017. Is Vietnam's exchange rate overvalued?. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy* **22**:3, 357-371. [[Crossref](#)]

75. Yacine Hammami, Abdelmonem Oueslati. 2017. Measuring skill in the Islamic mutual fund industry: Evidence from GCC countries. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* **49**, 15-31. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Michael D. Bordo, Ehsan U. Choudhri, Giorgio Fazio, Ronald MacDonald. 2017. The real exchange rate in the long run: Balassa-Samuelson effects reconsidered. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **75**, 69-92. [[Crossref](#)]
77. Yi Lu, Zhigang Tao, Lianming Zhu. 2017. Identifying FDI spillovers. *Journal of International Economics* **107**, 75-90. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Michele Ca' Zorzi, Marcin Kolasa, Michał Rubaszek. 2017. Exchange rate forecasting with DSGE models. *Journal of International Economics* **107**, 127-146. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Dilem Yıldırım. 2017. Empirical investigation of purchasing power parity for Turkey: Evidence from recent nonlinear unit root tests. *Central Bank Review* **17**:2, 39-45. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Wei Ma, Haiqi Li, Sung Y. Park. 2017. Empirical conditional quantile test for purchasing power parity: Evidence from East Asian countries. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **49**, 211-222. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Andreas Benedictow, Pål Boug. 2017. Calculating the real return on a sovereign wealth fund. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* **50**:2, 571-594. [[Crossref](#)]
82. Bernard Njindan Iyke. 2017. Real exchange rates persistence in the West African monetary zone: a revisit of the PPP puzzle. *International Journal of Emerging Markets* **12**:2, 366-383. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Thomas Walther, Tony Klein, Hien Pham Thu, Krzysztof Piontek. 2017. True or spurious long memory in European non-EMU currencies. *Research in International Business and Finance* **40**, 217-230. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Bernard Njindan Iyke, Nicholas M. Odhiambo. 2017. Foreign exchange markets and the purchasing power parity theory. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies* **8**:1, 89-102. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang, Tsung-Hsien Chen, Han-Wen Tzeng. 2017. Revisiting purchasing power parity in Eastern European countries: quantile unit root tests. *Empirical Economics* **52**:2, 463-483. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Lukas Menkhoff, Lucio Sarno, Maik Schmeling, Andreas Schrimpf. 2017. Currency Value. *Review of Financial Studies* **30**:2, 416-441. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Thomas J. O'Brien, Santiago Ruiz de Vargas. 2017. The Adjusted Big Mac Methodology: A Clarification. *Journal of International Financial Management & Accounting* **28**:1, 70-85. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Robert C. Feenstra, Alan M. Taylor. Exchange Rates I: The Monetary Approach in the Long Run 428-465. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Robert C. Feenstra, Alan M. Taylor. Exchange Rates I: The Monetary Approach in the Long Run 58-96. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Michael Melvin, Stefan Norrbin. Prices, Exchange Rates, and Purchasing Power Parity 135-154. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Hui Ding, Jaebeom Kim. 2017. Inflation-targeting and real interest rate parity: A bias correction approach. *Economic Modelling* **60**, 132-137. [[Crossref](#)]
92. Antonio Afonso, Florence Huart, Joo Tovar Jalles, Piotr Leszek Stanek. 2017. Assessing the Sustainability of External Imbalances in the European Union. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
93. Eu Joon Chang, Young Se Kim. 2017. Regional Relative Price Disparities and Their Driving Forces. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
94. Claire Giordano, Gianni Toniolo, Francesco Zollino. 2017. Long-Run Trends in Italian Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]



95. William Miles. 2017. Home Prices and Fundamentals: Solving the Mystery for the G-7 by Accounting for Nonlinearities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
96. O. Malakhovskaya. 2016. DSGE-based forecasting: What should our perspective be?. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :12, 129-146. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Ernesto Leon Castro, Ezequiel Aviles Ochoa, Jose Maria MerigoLindahl, Anna Maria Gil Lafuente. Heavy Moving Averages in exchange rate forecasting 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang, Tsung-Hsien Chen, Han-Wen Tzeng. 2016. Quantile unit root test and the PPP in Africa. *Applied Economics* **74**, 1-9. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang, Kuei-Chiu Lee. 2016. Purchasing power parity in emerging markets: A panel stationary test with both sharp and smooth breaks. *Economic Systems* **40**:3, 453-460. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Fadi Hassan. 2016. The price of development: The Penn–Balassa–Samuelson effect revisited. *Journal of International Economics* **102**, 291-309. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Yiguo Sun, Zongwu Cai, Qi Li. 2016. A CONSISTENT NONPARAMETRIC TEST ON SEMIPARAMETRIC SMOOTH COEFFICIENT MODELS WITH INTEGRATED TIME SERIES. *Econometric Theory* **32**:4, 988-1022. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Luke Lin, Chun I. Lee. 2016. Central Bank Intervention, Exchange Rate Regime and the Purchasing Power Parity. *The World Economy* **39**:8, 1256-1274. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Michele Ca' Zorzi, Jakub Muck, Michal Rubaszek. 2016. Real Exchange Rate Forecasting and PPP: This Time the Random Walk Loses. *Open Economies Review* **27**:3, 585-609. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Astrid Ayala, Szabolcs Blazsek, Juncal Cuñado, Luis Albériko Gil-Alana. 2016. Regime-switching purchasing power parity in Latin America: Monte Carlo unit root tests with dynamic conditional score. *Applied Economics* **48**:29, 2675-2696. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Ahmad Zubaidi BAHARUMSHAH, Siew-Voon SOON, Stilianos FOUNTAS, Nurul Sima MOHAMAD SHARIFF. 2016. PERSISTENCE OF REAL EXCHANGE RATES IN THE CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* **17**:3, 381-396. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Mehmet Akif DESTEK, İlyas OKUMUŞ. 2016. Investigation of the Validity of Purchasing Power Parity Hypothesis with Fourier Unit Root Tests: The Case of OECD Countries. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences* **15**:24218, 73-87. [[Crossref](#)]
107. Helmut Herwartz, Florian Siedenburg, Yabibal M. Walle. 2016. Heteroskedasticity Robust Panel Unit Root Testing Under Variance Breaks in Pooled Regressions. *Econometric Reviews* **35**:5, 727-750. [[Crossref](#)]
108. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang, Kuei-Chiu Lee. 2016. Panel asymmetric nonlinear unit root test and PPP in Africa. *Applied Economics Letters* **23**:8, 554-558. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Alberto Cavallo, Roberto Rigobon. 2016. The Billion Prices Project: Using Online Prices for Measurement and Research. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **30**:2, 151-178. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
110. Benjamin Furlan, Martin Gächter, Bob Krebs, Harald Oberhofer. 2016. Democratization and Real Exchange Rates,. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* **63**:2, 216-242. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Chi Wei Su, Hsu-Ling Chang, Chengsi Zhang. 2016. Nonlinear Taylor rules in Central Eastern European countries. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* **25**:3, 357-376. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Walter Dettling, Anna Hitz. 2016. Mobile Communication Price Parity and index: Making money off the poor. *Telematics and Informatics* **33**:1, 187-204. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Giancarlo Gandolfo. Exchange-Rate Determination 333-384. [[Crossref](#)]

114. Kadir Karagöz, T. Bahadır Saraç. 2016. Testing the Validity of PPP Theory for Turkey: Nonlinear Unit Root Testing. *Procedia Economics and Finance* **38**, 458-467. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Claudio Roberto Fóffano Vasconcelos, Luiz A. Lima Júnior. 2016. Validity of purchasing power parity for selected Latin American countries: Linear and non-linear unit root tests. *Economía* **17**:1, 114-125. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Shamim Ahmed, Xiaoquan Liu, Giorgio Valente. 2016. Can currency-based risk factors help forecast exchange rates?. *International Journal of Forecasting* **32**:1, 75-97. [[Crossref](#)]
117. Alenka Kavkler, Darja Boršič, Jani Bekő. 2016. Is the PPP valid for the EA-11 countries? New evidence from nonlinear unit root tests. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja* **29**:1, 612-622. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Charlie X. Cai, Qi Zhang. 2016. High-Frequency Exchange Rate Forecasting. *European Financial Management* **22**:1, 120-141. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Tobias F. RRtheli. 2016. Does History Help Predict International Inflation Differentials?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
120. Charles Yuji Horioka. 2016. A Possible Explanation of the Exchange Rate Disconnect Puzzle: A Common Solution to Three Major Macroeconomic Puzzles?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
121. Manuel I. Bertolotto. 2016. The Perils of Using Aggregate Data in Real Exchange Rate Estimations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
122. Soumya Kanti Ghosh, Hiranya K. Nath. 2016. Are Bilateral Real Exchange Rates Stationary? Revisiting the Evidence from India. *Theoretical Economics Letters* **06**:05, 1196-1204. [[Crossref](#)]
123. G♦♦bor Reg♦♦s. 2015. Modeling the exchange rate using price levels and country risk. *Cogent Economics & Finance* **3**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
124. Lein-Lein Chen, Seungmook Choi, John Devereux. 2015. Accounting for real exchange rate changes at long time horizons. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **46**, 264-277. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Michel Beine, Serge Coulombe, Wessel N. Vermeulen. 2015. Dutch Disease and the Mitigation Effect of Migration: Evidence from Canadian Provinces. *The Economic Journal* **125**:589, 1574-1615. [[Crossref](#)]
126. André M. Marques, Fábio Pesavento. 2015. Searching for long-range dependence in real effective exchange rate: towards parity?. *Estudos Econômicos (São Paulo)* **45**:4, 821-857. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Janice Boucher Breuer, Vikram Kumar, Shyam Gouri Suresh. 2015. Inter-Temporal Purchasing Power Parity. *Open Economies Review* **26**:5, 869-891. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Tommaso Mancini Griffoli, Christoph Meyer, Jean-Marc Natal, Attilio Zanetti. 2015. Determinants of the Swiss Franc Real Exchange Rate. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics* **151**:4, 299-331. [[Crossref](#)]
129. . References 527-542. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Chun Jiang, Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang. 2015. Revisiting Purchasing Power Parity in OECD. *Applied Economics* **47**:40, 4323-4334. [[Crossref](#)]
131. António Afonso, Christophe Rault. 2015. Multi-step analysis of public finances sustainability. *Economic Modelling* **48**, 199-209. [[Crossref](#)]
132. André M. Marques. 2015. Persistência da taxa de câmbio real: um estudo a partir do estimador local de Whittle. *Nova Economia* **25**:2, 311-324. [[Crossref](#)]
133. ###, ###. 2015. Revisiting Balassa-Samuelson Model of Long-run Exchange Rate. *The Journal of International Trade & Commerce* **11**:4, 237-255. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, ABM Nasir. 2015. Purchasing Power Parity and the Law of One Price: Evidence from Commodity Prices in Asian Countries. *Global Economy Journal* **15**:2, 231-240. [[Crossref](#)]

135. Robert Czudaj, Jan Prüser. 2015. International parity relationships between Germany and the USA revisited: evidence from the post-DM period. *Applied Economics* 47:26, 2745-2767. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Jörg Mahlich, Jörn Sintern, Moritz Supplet. 2015. Vergleichbarkeit internationaler Arzneimittelpreise. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 16:2, 164-172. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang, Shu-Ching Cheng, Tsung-Pao Wu. 2015. Revisiting purchasing power parity in major oil-exporting countries. *Macroeconomics and Finance in Emerging Market Economies* 8:1-2, 108-116. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Christian D. Dick, Ronald MacDonald, Lukas Menkhoff. 2015. Exchange rate forecasts and expected fundamentals. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 53, 235-256. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Gary Madden, Ismail Saglam, Inayat Hussain. 2015. Spectrum auction designs and revenue variations. *Applied Economics* 47:17, 1748-1763. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Alejandro Fiorito, Nahuel Guaita, Silvio Guaita. 2015. Neodesarrollismo y el tipo de cambio competitivo. *Cuadernos de Economía* 34:64, 45-88. [[Crossref](#)]
141. Nicholas J. Mangee. 2015. A Kuhnian perspective on asset pricing theory. *Journal of Economic Methodology* 22:1, 28-45. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Srdjan Marinković. Managing the Financial Crisis: Credit Crunch and Response in Serbia 171-196. [[Crossref](#)]
143. . References 337-340. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Chao-Hsi Huang, Chih-Yuan Yang. 2015. European exchange rate regimes and purchasing power parity: An empirical study on eleven eurozone countries. *International Review of Economics & Finance* 35, 100-109. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Lukas Menkhoff, Lucio Sarno, Maik Schmeling, Andreas Schrimpf. 2015. Currency Value. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
146. Thomas J. O'Brien, Santiago Ruiz de Vargas. 2015. Clarifying the Adjusted Big Mac Index. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
147. Raymond Robertson, Anil Kumar, Donald H. Dutkowsky. 2014. Weak-form and strong-form purchasing power parity between the US and Mexico: A panel cointegration investigation. *Journal of Macroeconomics* 42, 241-262. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Rod Tyers, Ying Zhang. 2014. Real exchange rate determination and the China puzzle. *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature* 28:2, 1-32. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Ashima Goyal. 2014. Purchasing Power Parity, Wages and Inflation in Emerging Markets. *Foreign Trade Review* 49:4, 327-347. [[Crossref](#)]
150. . Global Profiles of Poverty and Shared Prosperity, Data, and Measurement Issues 225-261. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Natalie D. Hegwood, Hiranya K. Nath. 2014. Real exchange rate dynamics: Evidence from India. *Economic Analysis and Policy* 44:4, 396-404. [[Crossref](#)]
152. SUNG-IL CHO. 2014. Does the Purchasing Power Parity Hypothesis Hold? - The Panel Data Case of Big Mac Hamburger Prices -. *The Journal of International Trade & Commerce* 10:5, 841-856. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Giorgio Canarella, Stephen M. Miller, Stephen K. Pollard. 2014. Purchasing Power Parity Between the UK and Germany: The Euro Era. *Open Economies Review* 25:4, 677-699. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Chi-Wei Su, Hsu-Ling Chang, Tsangyao Chang, Kedong Yin. 2014. Monetary convergence in East Asian countries relative to China. *International Review of Economics & Finance* 33, 228-237. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Alice Kones, Tsangyao Chang. 2014. Purchasing Power Parity in African Countries: Evidence from the Sequential Panel Selection Method. *Economic Papers: A journal of applied economics and policy* 33:3, 295-304. [[Crossref](#)]

156. Vera Thorstensen, Emerson Marçal, Lucas Ferraz. 2014. Trade rules and exchange rate misalignments: in search for a WTO solution. *Revista de Economia Política* 34:3, 370-395. [[Crossref](#)]
157. Axel Grossmann, Chris Paul, Marc W. Simpson. 2014. The equilibrium level and forecasting performance of nominal effective exchange rate indexes using an export and import price-based relative PPP model. *Applied Financial Economics* 24:15, 1017-1030. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Wen Long Zhang, Hsu-Ling Chang, Chi-Wei Su. 2014. Do real interest rates converge across Latin american countries?. *Portuguese Economic Journal* 13:2, 117-130. [[Crossref](#)]
159. Dirk Michael Boehe. 2014. Strategic hedging: Evidence from Brazilian exporters. *Journal of World Business* 49:3, 290-300. [[Crossref](#)]
160. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Alice Kones. 2014. Real and nominal effective exchange rates of African countries during 1971Q1–2012Q4. *Applied Economics* 46:17, 1961-1984. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Kai-Yin Woo, Shu-Kam Lee, Alan Chan. 2014. Non-linear adjustments to intranational PPP. *Journal of Macroeconomics* 40, 360-371. [[Crossref](#)]
162. William J. Crowder. 2014. Real Exchange Rate Persistence in US Dollar PPP Systems. *International Finance* 17:2, 209-240. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Hsu-Ling Chang. 2014. Revisiting real interest rate parity in Central and Eastern European countries: The Sequential Panel Selection Method. *Acta Oeconomica* 64:2, 181-196. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Fabien Candau, Michaël Goujon, Jean-François Hoarau, Serge Rey. 2014. Real exchange rate and competitiveness of an EU's ultra-peripheral region: La Reunion Island. *International Economics* 137, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
165. William Q Judge, Stav Fainshmidt, J Lee Brown III. 2014. Which model of capitalism best delivers both wealth and equality?. *Journal of International Business Studies* 45:4, 363-386. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Rose Olayo, Charles Wafula, Evalyne Aseyo, Constantine Loum, Dan Kaseje. 2014. A quasi-experimental assessment of the effectiveness of the Community Health Strategy on health outcomes in Kenya. *BMC Health Services Research* 14:S1. . [[Crossref](#)]
167. Chen Hsun Lee, Yung Hsiang Ying, Ginny Ju Ann Yang. 2014. Assessing Whether Tourist Arrivals are Stationary: Evidence from Taiwan using Sequential Panel Selection Method. *Journal of China Tourism Research* 10:2, 206-221. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Axel Grossmann, Marc W. Simpson, Teofilo Ozuna. 2014. Investigating the PPP hypothesis using constructed U.S. dollar equilibrium exchange rate misalignments over the post-bretton woods period. *Journal of Economics and Finance* 38:2, 235-268. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Lein-Lein Chen, Seungmook Choi, John Devereux. 2014. Explaining Price Level Differences: New Evidence on the Balassa-Samuelson Effect. *Southern Economic Journal* 140212121118009. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Kuei-Chiu Lee. 2014. Is per capita real GDP stationary in China? Sequential panel selection method. *Economic Modelling* 37, 507-517. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Kristofer Månsson, Pär Sjölander. 2014. Testing for nonlinear panel unit roots under cross-sectional dependency — With an application to the PPP hypothesis. *Economic Modelling* 38, 121-132. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Huizhen He, Ming Che Chou, Tsangyao Chang. 2014. Purchasing power parity for 15 Latin American countries: Panel SURKSS test with a Fourier function. *Economic Modelling* 36, 37-43. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Jen-Je Su, Adrian (Wai-Kong) Cheung, Eduardo Roca. 2014. Does Purchasing Power Parity hold? New evidence from wild-bootstrapped nonlinear unit root tests in the presence of heteroskedasticity. *Economic Modelling* 36, 161-171. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Tsangyao Chang, Hsiao-Ping Chu, Omid Ranjbar. 2014. Are GDP fluctuations transitory or permanent in African countries? Sequential Panel Selection Method. *International Review of Economics & Finance* 29, 380-399. [[Crossref](#)]

175. Jingping Gu, Zhongwen Liang. 2014. Testing cointegration relationship in a semiparametric varying coefficient model. *Journal of Econometrics* **178**, 57-70. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Fernando Alvarez, Avinash Dixit. 2014. A real options perspective on the future of the Euro. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **61**, 78-109. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Jiahua Li, Ilias Tsiakas, Wei Wang. 2014. Predicting Exchange Rates Out of Sample: Can Economic Fundamentals Beat the Random Walk?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
178. Katarina Juselius. 2014. Testing for Near I (2) Trends When the Signal to Noise Ratio is Small. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
179. Max Groneck, Christoph Kaufmann. 2014. Relative Sectoral Prices and Population Ageing: A Common Trend. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
180. Zhibai Zhang. 2014. Is There a Rule of Thumb for Absolute Purchasing Power Parity to Hold?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
181. Pierluigi Balduzzi, I-Hsuan Ethan Chiang. 2014. Real Exchange Rates and Currency Risk Premia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
182. Paolo Tasca, Calebe de Roure. 2014. Bitcoin and the PPP Puzzle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
183. Azra Alam, Arshad Ali Bhatti. 2014. Relative Commodity Price Convergence in Pakistan. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
184. Irena Maaerinskienn, Andrius Balciunas. 2014. Fundamental Exchange Rate Forecasting Models: Advantages and Drawbacks. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
185. Huizhen He, Omid Ranjbar, Tsangyao Chang. 2013. Purchasing power parity in transition countries: Old wine with new bottle. *Japan and the World Economy* **28**, 24-32. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Denis V. Kadochnikov. 2013. Gustav Cassel's purchasing power parity doctrine in the context of his views on international economic policy coordination. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* **20**:6, 1101-1121. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Tsangyao Chang, Ken Hung. 2013. Revisiting purchasing power parity in Latin America: sequential panel selection method. *Applied Economics* **45**:32, 4584-4590. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Gokhan Karabulut, Mehmet Huseyin Bilgin, Giray Gozgor. 2013. Purchasing Power Parity Hypothesis: Mixed Evidence from Eastern Europe Emerging Markets. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* **49**:sup5, 213-227. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Ding Du, Pin Ng, Xiaobing Zhao. 2013. Measuring currency exposure with quantile regression. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting* **41**:3, 549-566. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Stephen G. Hall, George Hondroyannis, Amangeldi Kenjegaliev, P.A.V.B. Swamy, George S. Tavlas. 2013. Is the relationship between prices and exchange rates homogeneous?. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **37**, 411-438. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Ming-Jen Chang, Chang-Ching Lin, Shou-Yung Yin. 2013. The Behaviour of Real Exchange Rates: The Case of Japan. *Pacific Economic Review* **18**:4, 530-545. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Charles Wyplosz. 2013. The Eurozone Crisis and the Competitiveness Legend. *Asian Economic Papers* **12**:3, 63-81. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Huizhen He, Tsangyao Chang. 2013. Purchasing power parity in transition countries: Sequential panel selection method. *Economic Modelling* **35**, 604-609. [[Crossref](#)]
194. Yamin Ahmad, Ming Chien Lo, Olena Mykhaylova. 2013. Causes of nonlinearities in low-order models of the real exchange rate. *Journal of International Economics* **91**:1, 128-141. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Luke Lin, Wenyan Lin. 2013. EXCHANGE RATE REVERSION UNDER REGIMES OTHER THAN FREE FLOAT. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **18**:3, 293-306. [[Crossref](#)]



196. Mario Gómez Aguirre, José Carlos Rodríguez Chávez. 2013. El efecto Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson El caso de México. *Contaduría y Administración* **58**:3, 121-147. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Tsangyao Chang, Chi-Wei Su. 2013. Revisiting purchasing power parity for East Asian countries using the rank test for nonlinear cointegration. *Applied Economics* **45**:19, 2847-2852. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Takaaki Aoki. 2013. An empirical analysis on the law of purchasing power parity and international economic deepening. *Applied Economics* **45**:20, 2985-2993. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Nicolas Grinberg. 2013. Capital accumulation and ground-rent in Brazil: 1953–2008. *International Review of Applied Economics* **27**:4, 449-471. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Linhui Yu, Jiangyong Lu, Pinliang Luo. 2013. The Evolution of Price Dispersion in China's Passenger Car Markets. *The World Economy* **36**:7, 947-965. [[Crossref](#)]
201. Dimitrios Malliaropulos, Ekaterini Panopoulou, Theologos Pantelidis, Nikitas Pittis. 2013. Decomposing the persistence of real exchange rates. *Empirical Economics* **44**:3, 1217-1242. [[Crossref](#)]
202. Chia-Hao Lee, Pei-I Chou. 2013. The behavior of real exchange rate: Nonlinearity and breaks. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **27**, 125-133. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Georgios Gatopoulos, Henri Loubergé. 2013. Combined use of foreign debt and currency derivatives under the threat of currency crises: The case of Latin American firms. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **35**, 54-75. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Thomas M. Fullerton, André Varella Mollick. 2013. Border region panel evidence on PPP deviations. *Applied Economics* **45**:16, 2175-2182. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Hwa-Taek Lee, Gawon Yoon. 2013. Does purchasing power parity hold sometimes? Regime switching in real exchange rates. *Applied Economics* **45**:16, 2279-2294. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Lu Yang-Cheng, Chang Tsangyao, Lee Chia-Hao, Su Chi-Wei. 2013. REVISITING PURCHASING POWER PARITY FOR 15 LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES: THRESHOLD UNIT ROOT TEST. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **18**:2, 165-174. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Steven Gjerstad. 2013. Price dynamics in an exchange economy. *Economic Theory* **52**:2, 461-500. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Yan Liu, Hsu-Ling Chang, Chi-Wei Su. 2013. Do real interest rates converge across East Asian countries based on China?. *Economic Modelling* **31**, 467-473. [[Crossref](#)]
209. Richard Frensch, Achim Schmillen. 2013. The Penn Effect and Transition: The New EU Member States in International Perspective. *Comparative Economic Studies* **55**:1, 99-119. [[Crossref](#)]
210. D. Ventosa-Santaulària, M. Gómez-Zaldívar. 2013. A comment on 'Testing the validity of quasi-PPP hypothesis: evidence from a recent panel unit-root test with structural breaks'. *Applied Economics Letters* **20**:2, 111-113. [[Crossref](#)]
211. Tsangyao Chang, Han-Wen Tzeng. 2013. PURCHASING POWER PARITY IN NINE TRANSITION COUNTRIES: PANEL SURKSS TEST. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **18**:1, 74-81. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Luis Alberiko Gil-Alana, Liang Jiang. 2013. THE PURCHASING POWER PARITY HYPOTHESIS IN THE US-CHINA RELATIONSHIP: FRACTIONAL INTEGRATION, TIME VARIATION AND DATA FREQUENCY. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **18**:1, 82-92. [[Crossref](#)]
213. Philip Protter. A Mathematical Theory of Financial Bubbles 1-108. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Michael Melvin, Stefan C. Norrbin. Prices and Exchange Rates 129-148. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Eduardo Loría, Emmanuel Salas. 2013. Crucial exchange rate parity. Evidence for Mexico. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* **24**, 101-112. [[Crossref](#)]

216. Dongxiang Zhang, Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Ken Hung. 2013. Revisiting purchasing power parity for East Asian countries: sequential panel selection method. *Applied Economics Letters* **20**:1, 62-66. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Lukas Menkhoff, Lucio Sarno, Maik Schmeling, Andreas Schrimpf. 2013. Currency Risk Premia and Macro Fundamentals. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
218. Adrian R. Bell, Chris Brooks, Tony K Moore. 2013. Did Purchasing Power Parity Hold in Medieval Europe?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
219. Oxana Malakhovskaya, Alexey Minabutdinov. 2013. Are Commodity Price Shocks Important? A Bayesian Estimation of a DSGE Model for Russia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
220. Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Wen-Chi Liu. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment to purchasing power parity for ASEAN countries. *Japan and the World Economy* **24**:4, 325-331. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Siyue Liu, Dongxiang Zhang, Tsangyao Chang. 2012. Purchasing power parity – nonlinear threshold unit root test for transition countries. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**:18, 1781-1785. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Hui Ding, Jaebeom Kim. 2012. Does inflation targeting matter for PPP? An empirical investigation. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**:18, 1777-1780. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Jani Bekő, Alenka Kavkler, Darja Boršič. 2012. PPP and nonlinearity of real exchange rates: new evidence from transition economies. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**:18, 1851-1855. [[Crossref](#)]
224. MING-JEN CHANG, YI-WEN CHEN. 2012. REAL EXCHANGE RATE PERSISTENCE: EVIDENCE FROM THE WESTERN OFFSHOOTS\*. *The Manchester School* **80**:6, 718-739. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Hsu-Ling Chang, De-Chih Liu, Chi-Wei Su. 2012. Purchasing power parity with flexible Fourier stationary test for Central and Eastern European countries. *Applied Economics* **44**:32, 4249-4256. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Alenka Kavkler, Darja Boršič, Jani Bekő. 2012. PPP in Central and Eastern European economies: further evidence from panel unit root tests. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**:16, 1543-1548. [[Crossref](#)]
227. Ronald Mangani. 2012. Testing the PPP hypothesis in bilateral real exchange rates of the Malawi kwacha. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**:16, 1557-1560. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Chi-Wei Su, Hsu-Ling Chang, Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee. 2012. Purchasing power parity for BRICS: linear and nonlinear unit root tests with stationary covariates. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**:16, 1587-1591. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Gino Cenedese, Thomas Stolper. Currency Fair Value Models 313-342. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Menzie Chinn. Macro Approaches to Foreign Exchange Determination 45-71. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Paul De Grauwe, Pablo Rovira Kaltwasser. The Exchange Rate in a Behavioral Finance Framework 111-132. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Ian W. Marsh, Evgenia Passari, Lucio Sarno. Purchasing Power Parity in Tradable Goods 189-220. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Pasquale Della Corte, Ilias Tsiakas. Statistical and Economic Methods for Evaluating Exchange Rate Predictability 221-263. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Michail Karoglou, Bruce Morley. 2012. Purchasing power parity and structural instability in the US/UK exchange rate. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* **22**:4, 958-972. [[Crossref](#)]
235. Claude Lopez, David H. Papell. 2012. Convergence of Euro area inflation rates. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **31**:6, 1440-1458. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Òscar Jordà, Alan M. Taylor. 2012. The carry trade and fundamentals: Nothing to fear but FEER itself. *Journal of International Economics* **88**:1, 74-90. [[Crossref](#)]



237. Ilir Miteza. 2012. The Law of One Price in Six Central and Eastern European Economies. *Comparative Economic Studies* 54:3, 581-596. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Chi-Wei Su, Hsu-Ling Chang, Meng-Nan Zhu. 2012. Flexible Fourier stationary test in purchasing power parity for African countries. *Applied Economics* 44:25, 3255-3262. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Chi-Wei Su, Tsangyao Chang, Yu-Shao Liu. 2012. Revisiting purchasing power parity for African countries: with nonlinear panel unit-root tests. *Applied Economics* 44:25, 3263-3273. [[Crossref](#)]
240. Tze-Haw Chan, Chee-Wooi Hooy. 2012. Malaysia-China in the Liberalization Era: Structural Modelling of International Parity Conditions and Transmission Mechanism. *Global Economic Review* 41:3, 259-277. [[Crossref](#)]
241. THANDINKOSI NDHLELA. 2012. IMPLICATIONS OF REAL EXCHANGE RATE MISALIGNMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: THEORY, EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE AND APPLICATION TO GROWTH PERFORMANCE IN ZIMBABWE. *South African Journal of Economics* 80:3, 319-344. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Salah A. Nusair. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment of Asian real exchange rates. *Economic Change and Restructuring* 45:3, 221-246. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Ahmad Zubaidi Baharumshah, Siew-Voon Soon. 2012. Mean reversion in bilateral real exchange rates: evidence from the Malaysian ringgit. *Applied Economics* 44:22, 2921-2933. [[Crossref](#)]
244. Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Ken Hung. 2012. Can the PPP stand on the BRICS? The ADL test for threshold cointegration. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:12, 1123-1127. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Luca Zanin, Giampiero Marra. 2012. Assessing the functional relationship between CO2 emissions and economic development using an additive mixed model approach. *Economic Modelling* 29:4, 1328-1337. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Tsangyao Chang, Chi-Wei Su, Chia-Hao Lee. 2012. Purchasing power parity nonlinear threshold unit root test for East-Asian countries. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:10, 975-979. [[Crossref](#)]
247. Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Pei-I Chou, Shiou-Chih Wang. 2012. Purchasing Power Parity for Transition Countries. *Eastern European Economics* 50:4, 42-59. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Miguel de Carvalho, Paulo Júlio. 2012. Digging out the PPP hypothesis: an integrated empirical coverage. *Empirical Economics* 42:3, 713-744. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Seref Bozoklu, Sinem Kutlu. 2012. Linear and Nonlinear Cointegration of Purchasing Power Parity: Further Evidence from Developing Countries. *Global Economic Review* 41:2, 147-162. [[Crossref](#)]
250. Tsangyao Chang, Chi-Wei Su, Yu-Shao Liu. 2012. Purchasing power parity with nonlinear threshold unit root test. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:9, 839-842. [[Crossref](#)]
251. Tsangyao Chang. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment to purchasing power parity in China. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:9, 843-848. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Guochen Pan, Tsangyao Chang, D.P. Tang, Chia-Hao Lee. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment to purchasing power parity in Latin American countries: the ADL test for threshold cointegration. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:9, 857-862. [[Crossref](#)]
253. Guochen Pan, Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Wen-Chi Liu. 2012. Revisiting purchasing power parity for 18 African countries: sequential panel selection method. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:9, 877-881. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Chi Keung Marco Lau, Farrukh Suvankulov, Yongyang Su, Frankie Chau. 2012. Some cautions on the use of nonlinear panel unit root tests: Evidence from a modified series-specific non-linear panel unit-root test. *Economic Modelling* 29:3, 810-816. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Yang-Cheng Ralph Lu, Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment to purchasing power parity in transition countries: the ADL test for threshold cointegration. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:7, 629-633. [[Crossref](#)]

256. Yanping Chong, Òscar Jordà, Alan M. Taylor. 2012. THE HARROD-BALASSA-SAMUELSON HYPOTHESIS: REAL EXCHANGE RATES AND THEIR LONG-RUN EQUILIBRIUM\*. *International Economic Review* 53:2, 609-634. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Siyue Liu, Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Pei-I Chou. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment to purchasing power parity: the ADL test for threshold cointegration. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:6, 569-573. [[Crossref](#)]
258. Mariam Camarero, Javier Ordóñez. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment in the real dollar-euro exchange rate: The role of the productivity differential as a fundamental. *Economic Modelling* 29:2, 444-449. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Morten Jerven. 2012. An unlevel playing field: national income estimates and reciprocal comparison in global economic history. *Journal of Global History* 7:1, 107-128. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Tsangyao Chang, Yu-Shao Liu, Chi-Wei Su. 2012. Purchasing power parity with nonlinear and asymmetric smooth adjustment for the Middle Eastern countries. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:5, 487-491. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Chikashi Tsuji. 2012. Positive return premia in Japan. *Quantitative Finance* 12:3, 345-367. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Pei-I Chou. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment to purchasing power parity in G-7 countries. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:2, 123-128. [[Crossref](#)]
263. Tsangyao Chang, Hsu-Ling Chang, Ken Hung, Chi-Wei Su. 2012. Nonlinear adjustment to purchasing power parity for Germany's real exchange rate relative to its major trading partners. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:2, 197-202. [[Crossref](#)]
264. D. Kadochnikov. 2012. International Coordination of Financial and Economic Policy: Gustav Cassels Theoretical Contribution. *Voprosy Ekonomiki* :1, 51-64. [[Crossref](#)]
265. Kenneth W. Clements, Yihui Lan, Shi Pei Seah. 2012. The Big Mac Index two decades on: an evaluation of burgeronomics. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 17:1, 31-60. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Bing Zhu. Exchange Rate and Price: A Granger Causality Test of Consumer Price Index in China 89-94. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Darja Boršič, Ahmad Zubaidi Baharumshah, Jani Bekő. 2012. Are we getting closer to purchasing power parity in Central and Eastern European economies?. *Applied Economics Letters* 19:1, 87-91. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Klára Plecíť, Luboš Štřelec. 2012. On equilibrium real exchange rates in euro area: Special focus on behavioral equilibrium exchange rates in Ireland and Greece. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis* 60:2, 261-270. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Gene Hsin Chang. 2012. Theory and Refinement of the Enhanced-PPP Model for Estimation Equilibrium Exchange Rates with Estimates for Valuations of Dollar, Yuan and Others. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
270. Benjamin Furlan, Martin Gächter, Bob Krebs, Harald Oberhofer. 2012. Democratization and Real Exchange Rates. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
271. Philip Protter. 2012. A Mathematical Theory of Financial Bubbles. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
272. Zhibai Zhang. 2012. A Simple Model and its Application in the Valuation of Five Asian Real Exchange Rates. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
273. Michele Ca'Zorzi, Michal Rubaszek. 2012. Real Exchange Rate Forecasting: A Calibrated Half-Life PPP Model Can Beat the Random Walk. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
274. Ian McFarlane. 2012. Commodity Currency: An Alternative Route to Currency Union. *Modern Economy* 03:02, 139-144. [[Crossref](#)]

275. Alun H. Thomas. 2012. Exchange Rate and Foreign Interest Rate Linkages for Sub-Saharan Africa Floaters. *IMF Working Papers* 12:208, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
276. Václav Žďárek. 2012. An Empirical Investigation of the Purchasing Power Parity Hypothesis in European Transition Countries. *Prague Economic Papers* 21:3, 257-276. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee, Pei-I Chou, Dai-Piao Tang. 2011. Revisiting long-run purchasing power parity with asymmetric adjustment for G-7 countries. *Japan and the World Economy* 23:4, 259-264. [[Crossref](#)]
278. David O. Cushman, Nils Michael. 2011. Nonlinear trends in real exchange rates: A panel unit root test approach. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 30:8, 1619-1637. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Gawon Yoon. 2011. An empirical demonstration of classical comparative cost theory: a correction to Balassa (). *Applied Financial Economics* 21:23, 1765-1767. [[Crossref](#)]
280. Tsangyao Chang, Kuei-Chiu Lee, Yang-Cheng Ralph Lu, Guochen Pan. 2011. Revisiting purchasing power parity for G-7 countries using nonparametric rank test for cointegration. *Applied Economics Letters* 18:18, 1795-1800. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Tsung-Hsien Chen, Tsangyao Chang, Yi-Chun Zhang, Chia-Hao Lee. 2011. Purchasing power parity in Mainland China and Taiwan: an empirical note based on threshold unit root test. *Applied Economics Letters* 18:18, 1807-1812. [[Crossref](#)]
282. Yukio Fukumoto. 2011. International price dispersions of the Big Mac and economic integration. *Applied Economics Letters* 18:17, 1633-1638. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Yang-Cheng Ralph Lu, Tsangyao Chang, Kuei-Chiu Lee, Han-Wen Tzeng. 2011. An empirical test of the purchasing power parity for transition economies: Panel SURADF tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 18:17, 1691-1696. [[Crossref](#)]
284. Carlos Carvalho,, Fernanda Nechio. 2011. Aggregation and the PPP Puzzle in a Sticky-Price Model. *American Economic Review* 101:6, 2391-2424. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
285. Marc W. Simpson, Axel Grossmann. 2011. Can a relative purchasing power parity-based model outperform a random walk in forecasting short-term exchange rates?. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 16:4, 375-392. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Chi-Wei Su, Chang Tsangyao, Hsu-Ling Chang. 2011. Purchasing power parity for fifteen Latin American countries: Stationary test with a Fourier function. *International Review of Economics & Finance* 20:4, 839-845. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Yiguo Sun, Cheng Hsiao, Qi Li. 2011. Measuring correlations of integrated but not cointegrated variables: A semiparametric approach. *Journal of Econometrics* 164:2, 252-267. [[Crossref](#)]
288. Doo-Yull Choi, Bong-Han Kim, See-Won Kim. 2011. Nonlinear mean-reversion in Southeast Asian real exchange rates. *Applied Financial Economics* 21:19, 1409-1421. [[Crossref](#)]
289. HELMUT HERWARTZ, JAN ROESTEL. 2011. Convergence of Real Capital Market Interest Rates-Evidence from Inflation Indexed Bonds. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 43:7, 1523-1541. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Samira Haddou. 2011. Is Tunisian Real Effective Exchange Rate Mean Reverting? Evidence from Nonlinear Models. *Transition Studies Review* 18:1, 164-178. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Su Zhou, Ali M. Kutan. 2011. Is the evidence for PPP reliable? A sustainability examination of the stationarity of real exchange rates. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 35:9, 2479-2490. [[Crossref](#)]
292. Philip L. Brock. 2011. The Penn-Balassa-Samuelson effect through the lens of the dependent economy model. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 35:9, 1547-1556. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Jan Marc Berk, Job Swank. 2011. Price level convergence and regional Phillips curves in the US and EMU. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 30:5, 749-763. [[Crossref](#)]

294. Gabriel Porcile, Alexandre Gomes de Souza, Ricardo Viana. 2011. External debt sustainability and policy rules in a small globalized economy. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* **22**:3, 269-276. [[Crossref](#)]
295. Chunming Yuan. 2011. The exchange rate and macroeconomic determinants: Time-varying transitional dynamics. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* **22**:2, 197-220. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Catherine S. F. Ho, M. Ariff. 2011. Sticky prices and time to equilibrium: evidence from Asia-Pacific trade-related economies. *Applied Economics* **43**:21, 2851-2861. [[Crossref](#)]
297. André M. Marques. 2011. Investigando a hipótese da paridade do poder de compra: um enfoque não linear. *Revista de Economia Contemporânea* **15**:2, 296-321. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Kamrul Hassan, Ruhul Salim. 2011. The linkage between relative population growth and purchasing power parity. *International Journal of Development Issues* **10**:2, 154-169. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Tuomas A. Peltonen, Adina Popescu, Michael Sager. 2011. Can non-linear real shocks explain the persistence of PPP exchange rate disequilibria?. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **16**:3, 290-306. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Joseph M. Kargbo. 2011. Capital flows, real exchange rate misalignment and PPP tests in emerging market countries. *Applied Economics* **43**:15, 1883-1897. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Derek Bond, Michael J. Harrison, Edward J. O'Brien. 2011. Nonlinearity and structural breaks in Irish PPP relationships: an application of random field regression. *Applied Economics* **43**:15, 1899-1911. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Yamin Ahmad, Stuart Glosser. 2011. Searching for nonlinearities in real exchange rates. *Applied Economics* **43**:15, 1829-1845. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Cheng-Feng Lee, Ching-Chuan Tsong. 2011. Covariate selection for testing purchasing power parity. *Applied Economics* **43**:15, 1923-1933. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Chi-Wei Su, Hsu-Ling Chang, Meng-Nan Zhu, Yi-Chu Lai. 2011. Purchasing power parity in major OPEC countries: nonlinear threshold unit root test. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:8, 719-722. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Yang-Cheng Lu, Tsangyao Chang. 2011. Long-run purchasing power parity with asymmetric adjustment: further evidence from China. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:9, 881-886. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Su-Yuan Lin, Horng-Jinh Chang, Tsangyao Chang. 2011. Revisiting purchasing power parity for nine transition countries: a Fourier stationary test. *Post-Communist Economies* **23**:02, 191-201. [[Crossref](#)]
307. OLAF KORN, PHILIPP KOZIOL. 2011. THE TERM STRUCTURE OF CURRENCY HEDGE RATIOS. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance* **14**:04, 525-557. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Tsangyao Chang, Han-Wen Tzeng. 2011. Long-run purchasing power parity with asymmetric adjustment: Further evidence from nine transition countries. *Economic Modelling* **28**:3, 1383-1391. [[Crossref](#)]
309. S. H. Hung, M. J. Weng. 2011. Panel unit root tests of purchasing power parity for Central Asian countries. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:6, 585-590. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Robert A. Jarrow, Philip Protter. 2011. Foreign currency bubbles. *Review of Derivatives Research* **14**:1, 67-83. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Hsu-Ling Chang, Chi-Wei Su, Meng-Nan Zhu, Pei Liu. 2011. Re-examining long-run purchasing power parity for Central and Eastern European countries: nonlinear panel unit root tests. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:5, 411-415. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Frederick H. Wallace. 2011. Purchasing power parity in Mexico: a historical note. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:4, 349-352. [[Crossref](#)]

313. Stefan Eichler. 2011. Exchange rate expectations and the pricing of Chinese cross-listed stocks. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **35**:2, 443-455. [[Crossref](#)]
314. Kees G. Koedijk, Ben Tims, Mathijs A. van Dijk. 2011. Why panel tests of purchasing power parity should allow for heterogeneous mean reversion. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **30**:1, 246-267. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Yang-Cheng Ralph Lu, Tsangyao Chang, Chi-Chen Chiu, Han-Wen Tzeng. 2011. Revisiting purchasing power parity for 16 Latin American countries: panel SURADF tests. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:3, 251-255. [[Crossref](#)]
316. Yi-Hua Wu, Eric S. Lin. 2011. Does purchasing power parity hold following the launch of the euro? Evidence from the panel unit root test. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:2, 167-172. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Augustine C. Arize. 2011. Purchasing power parity in LDCs: An empirical investigation. *Global Finance Journal* **22**:1, 56-71. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Alfred A. Haug, Syed A. Basher. 2011. Linear or nonlinear cointegration in the purchasing power parity relationship?. *Applied Economics* **43**:2, 185-196. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Tsangyao Chang, Yang-Cheng Lu, D. P. Tang, Wen-Chi Liu. 2011. Long-run purchasing power parity with asymmetric adjustment: further evidence from African countries. *Applied Economics* **43**:2, 231-242. [[Crossref](#)]
320. Claude Lopez, David H. Papell. 2011. Convergence of Euro Area Inflation Rates. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
321. Stefan Lyocsa, Tomas Vydrost, Eduard Baumohl. 2011. Unit-Root and Stationarity Testing with Empirical Application on Industrial Production of CEE-4 Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
322. Richard Frensch, Achim Daniel Schmillen. 2011. The Penn Effect and Transition: The New EU Member States in International Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
323. Jamal Ibrahim Haidar. 2011. Currency Valuation and Purchasing Power Parity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
324. Constantin Colonescu. 2011. Is Undergraduate Economics Curriculum Relevant?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
325. Stephen Broadberry, Claire Giordano, Francesco Zollino. 2011. A Sectoral Analysis of Italy's Development, 1861-2011. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
326. Andrew Swiston. 2011. Official Dollarization As a Monetary Regime: Its Effectson El Salvador. *IMF Working Papers* **11**:129, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
327. Tsangyao Chang, Yang-Cheng Lu, Wen-Chi Liu, Shu-Chen Kang. 2010. Revisiting purchasing power parity for major oil-exporting countries using panel SURADF tests. *Applied Economics Letters* **18**:1, 63-67. [[Crossref](#)]
328. Christoph Fischer, Daniel Porath. 2010. A reappraisal of the evidence on PPP: a systematic investigation into MA roots in panel unit root tests and their implications. *Empirical Economics* **39**:3, 767-792. [[Crossref](#)]
329. Helmut Herwartz, Florian Siedenburg. 2010. A New Approach to Unit Root Testing. *Computational Economics* **36**:4, 365-384. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Jean M. Imbs, Haroon Mumtaz, Morten O. Ravn, Hélène Rey. 2010. One TV, One Price?\*. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **112**:4, 753-781. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Miguel Lacerda, Johannes W. Fedderke, Linda M. Haines. 2010. TESTING FOR PURCHASING POWER PARITY AND UNCOVERED INTEREST PARITY IN THE PRESENCE OF MONETARY AND EXCHANGE RATE REGIME SHIFTS. *South African Journal of Economics* **78**:4, 363-382. [[Crossref](#)]

332. Tsangyao Chang, De-Piao Tang, Wen-Chi Liu, Chia-Hao Lee. 2010. Purchasing power parity for 15 COMESA and SADC countries: evidence based on panel SURADF tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:17, 1721-1727. [[Crossref](#)]
333. Marjan Senjur. 2010. Differential inflation, Phillips curves, and price competitiveness in a new euro-member country. *Economic Change and Restructuring* 43:4, 253-273. [[Crossref](#)]
334. Juan A. Jiménez-Martin, M. Dolores Robles-Fernandez. 2010. PPP: Delusion or Reality? Evidence from a Nonlinear Analysis. *Open Economies Review* 21:5, 679-704. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Kenneth W. Clements, Yihui Lan. 2010. A new approach to forecasting exchange rates. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 29:7, 1424-1437. [[Crossref](#)]
336. Jen-Chi Cheng, Larry W. Taylor, Wenlong Weng. 2010. The links between international parity conditions and Granger causality: a study of exchange rates and prices. *Applied Economics* 42:27, 3491-3501. [[Crossref](#)]
337. H. Levent Korap, Özgür Aslan. 2010. Re-examination of the long-run purchasing power parity: further evidence from Turkey. *Applied Economics* 42:27, 3559-3564. [[Crossref](#)]
338. Tsangyao Chang, Wen-Chi Liu, Chin-Ping Yu, Shuchen Kang. 2010. Purchasing power parity for 10 Latin American integration association countries: panel SURKSS tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:16, 1575-1580. [[Crossref](#)]
339. Tsangyao Chang, YiChun Zhang, Wen-Chi Liu. 2010. Purchasing power parity for ASEAN-8 countries: panel SURKSS tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:15, 1517-1523. [[Crossref](#)]
340. Ahmad Zubaidi Baharumshah, Venus Khim-Sen Liew, Ibrahim Chowdhury. 2010. Asymmetry dynamics in real exchange rates: New results on East Asian currencies. *International Review of Economics & Finance* 19:4, 648-661. [[Crossref](#)]
341. Dimitris K. Christopoulos, Miguel A. León-Ledesma. 2010. Smooth breaks and non-linear mean reversion: Post-Bretton Woods real exchange rates. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 29:6, 1076-1093. [[Crossref](#)]
342. Mehmet Huseyin Bilgin, Chi Keung Marco Lau, Ender Demir, Nijolė Astrauskienė. 2010. RENTAL PRICE CONVERGENCE IN A DEVELOPING ECONOMY: NEW EVIDENCE FROM NONLINEAR PANEL UNIT ROOT TEST. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management* 14:3, 245-257. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Scott W. Hegerty. 2010. Bounds testing cointegration methods and PPP: evidence from 123 Countries. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:14, 1335-1340. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Alper Aslan, Ferit Kula, Hüseyin Kalyoncu. 2010. Additional evidence of long-run purchasing power parity with black and official exchange rates. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:14, 1379-1382. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Tsangyao Chang, Wen-Chi Liu, Chin-Ping Yu. 2010. Revisiting purchasing power parity for G7 countries: further evidence based on panel SURKSS tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:14, 1383-1387. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Gawon Yoon. 2010. On the performance of a nonparametric measure of convergence towards purchasing power parity in the presence of linearity. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:14, 1389-1396. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Tsangyao Chang, Chia-Hao Lee. 2010. Revisiting purchasing power parity for East Asian countries: panel SURADF tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:13, 1329-1334. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Søren Johansen, Katarina Juselius, Roman Frydman, Michael Goldberg. 2010. Testing hypotheses in an model with piecewise linear trends. An analysis of the persistent long swings in the Dmk/\$ rate. *Journal of Econometrics* 158:1, 117-129. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Maxym Chaban. 2010. Cointegration analysis with structural breaks and deterministic trends: an application to the Canadian dollar. *Applied Economics* 42:23, 3023-3037. [[Crossref](#)]



350. Seher Nur Sulku. 2010. Econometric testing of purchasing power parity in less developed countries: fixed and flexible exchange rate regime experiences. *Applied Economics* 42:20, 2617-2630. [[Crossref](#)]
351. Tsangyao Chang, Wen-Chi Liu, Han-Wen Tzeng, Chin-Ping Yu. 2010. Purchasing power parity for G-7 countries: panel SURADF tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:12, 1223-1228. [[Crossref](#)]
352. Venus Khim-Sen Liew, Ricky Chee-Jiun Chia, Tai-Hu Ling. 2010. Long-run validity of purchasing power parity and rank tests for cointegration for Central Asian countries. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:11, 1073-1077. [[Crossref](#)]
353. Hsu-Ling Chang, Chi-Wei Su. 2010. Revisiting purchasing power parity for major OPEC countries: evidence based on nonlinear panel unit-root tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:11, 1119-1123. [[Crossref](#)]
354. Gawon Yoon. 2010. Nonlinearity in real exchange rates: an approach with disaggregated data and a new linearity test. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:11, 1125-1132. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Julián Ramajo, Montserrat Ferré. 2010. Purchasing power parity revisited: evidence from old and new tests for an organisation for economic co-operation and development panel. *Applied Economics* 42:17, 2243-2260. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Oh Donghwan, Hong Kyttack. 2010. Balassa-Samuelson Effect in Won/Dollar and Won/Yen Exchange Rates. *East Asian Economic Review* 14:1, 263-305. [[Crossref](#)]
357. Gawon Yoon. 2010. Nonlinear mean reversion in real exchange rates: threshold autoregressive models and stochastic unit root processes. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:8, 797-804. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Gawon Yoon. 2010. Does nonlinearity help resolve the Fisher effect puzzle?. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:8, 823-828. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Byung S. Min. 2010. Foreign Exchange Rates and FDI Behavior of Multinational Enterprises: Comparative Analysis Before and After the 1997 Korean Financial Crisis. *Journal of Asia Business Studies* 4:2, 100-108. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Yu Hsing. 2010. Analysis of movements in the AUD/USD exchange rate: comparison of four major models. *Applied Economics Letters* 17:6, 575-580. [[Crossref](#)]
361. Stefan C. Norrbin, Aaron D. Smallwood. 2010. Generalized long memory and mean reversion of the real exchange rate. *Applied Economics* 42:11, 1377-1386. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Gawon Yoon. 2010. Do real exchange rates really follow threshold autoregressive or exponential smooth transition autoregressive models?. *Economic Modelling* 27:2, 605-612. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Christoph Hanck. 2010. Are PPP tests erratically behaved? Some panel evidence. *International Review of Applied Economics* 24:2, 203-221. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Yu Hsing. 2010. Test of the Marshall–Lerner Condition for Eight Selected Asian Countries and Policy Implications. *Global Economic Review* 39:1, 91-98. [[Crossref](#)]
365. ahmad zubaidi baharumshah, evan lau, mudziviri t. nziramasanga. 2010. PURCHASING POWER PARITY IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES: EVIDENCE FROM PANEL SURADF TEST. *South African Journal of Economics* 78:1, 40-56. [[Crossref](#)]
366. Saadet Kasman, Adnan Kasman, Duygu Ayhan. 2010. Testing the Purchasing Power Parity Hypothesis for the New Member and Candidate Countries of the European Union: Evidence from Lagrange Multiplier Unit Root Tests with Structural Breaks. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* 46:2, 53-65. [[Crossref](#)]
367. Gawon Yoon. 2010. Nonlinear mean-reversion to purchasing power parity: exponential smooth transition autoregressive models and stochastic unit root processes. *Applied Economics* 42:4, 489-496. [[Crossref](#)]

368. Poomthan Rangakulnuwat, Sung Ahn, Holly Wang, Susan He. 2010. Extended generalized purchasing power parity and optimum currency area in East Asian countries. *Applied Economics* **42**:4, 497-513. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Derek Bond, Michael J. Harrison, Edward J. O'Brien. 2010. Exploring nonlinearity with random field regression. *Applied Economics Letters* **17**:2, 121-124. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Luciano Gutierrez, Cristina Brasili, Roberto Fanfani. The Behavior of Relative Food Prices: An Analysis across the European Countries 273-289. [[Crossref](#)]
371. António Afonso, Christophe Rault. 2010. What do we really know about fiscal sustainability in the EU? A panel data diagnostic. *Review of World Economics* **145**:4, 731-755. [[Crossref](#)]
372. Cristina Terra, Frederico Valladares. 2010. Real exchange rate misalignments. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **19**:1, 119-144. [[Crossref](#)]
373. Marjan Senjur. Persistent Differential Inflation Rates in the New Euro Member Countries: The Phillips Curve before and after Adopting the Euro 229-252. [[Crossref](#)]
374. Kenneth W. Clements, Yihui Lan, Shi Pei Seah. 2010. The Big Mac Index Two Decades on: An Evaluation of Burgernomics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
375. Carlos Carvalho, Fernanda Nechio. 2010. Aggregation and the PPP Puzzle in a Sticky-Price Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
376. Christophe Rault, Donatella Gatti, Anne-Gael Vaubourg. 2010. Unemployment and Finance: How do Financial and Labour Market Factors Interact?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
377. Robert A. Jarrow, Philip Protter. 2010. Foreign Currency Bubbles. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
378. Stephan Schulmeister. 2010. Boom-Bust Cycles and Trading Practices in Asset Markets, the Real Economy and the Effects of a Financial Transactions Tax. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
379. Marian Micu, Pavlin Savov, Sandeep Bhutani. 2010. Speculative Positioning Around Episodes of Central Bank Intervention: Evidence from the Yen/Dollar Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
380. Aurel Iancu. 2010. Transition, Integration and Convergence. The Case of Romania. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
381. Donghwan Oh, Kyttack Hong. 2010. ///, // Balassa-Samuelson (Balassa-Samuelson Effect in Won/Dollar and Won/Yen Exchange Rates). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
382. Kees C. G. Koedijk, Ben Tims, Mathijs A. Van Dijk. 2010. Why Panel Tests of Purchasing Power Parity Should Allow for Heterogeneous Mean Reversion. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
383. Jochen M. Schmittmann. 2010. Currency Hedging for International Portfolios. *IMF Working Papers* **10**:151, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
384. Raymond Robertson, Anil Kumar, Donald H. Dutkowsky. 2009. Purchasing Power Parity and aggregation bias for a developing country: The case of Mexico. *Journal of Development Economics* **90**:2, 237-243. [[Crossref](#)]
385. Jyh-Lin Wu, Yu-Hau Hu. 2009. New evidence on nominal exchange rate predictability. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **28**:6, 1045-1063. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Murat Doğanlar, Harun Bal, Mehmet Özmen. 2009. Testing long-run validity of purchasing power parity for selected emerging market economies. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:14, 1443-1448. [[Crossref](#)]
387. Yu Hsing, Bruno S. Sergi. 2009. THE DOLLAR/EURO EXCHANGE RATE AND A COMPARISON OF MAJOR MODELS. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* **10**:3, 199-205. [[Crossref](#)]

388. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Scott W. Hegerty. 2009. PURCHASING POWER PARITY IN LESS-DEVELOPED AND TRANSITION ECONOMIES: A REVIEW PAPER. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 23:4, 617-658. [[Crossref](#)]
389. L. Erdey, P. Földvári. 2009. Do Purchasing Power and Interest Rate Parities hold for the EUR/HUF exchange rate?. *Acta Oeconomica* 59:3, 289-306. [[Crossref](#)]
390. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Scott W. Hegerty, Ali M. Kutan. 2009. Is PPP sensitive to time-varying trade weights in constructing real effective exchange rates?. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 49:3, 1001-1008. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Fredj Jawadi. 2009. Essay in dividend modelling and forecasting: does nonlinearity help?. *Applied Financial Economics* 19:16, 1329-1343. [[Crossref](#)]
392. M. Hashem Pesaran, Ron P. Smith, Takashi Yamagata, Lyudmyla Hvozdyk. 2009. Pairwise Tests of Purchasing Power Parity. *Econometric Reviews* 28:6, 495-521. [[Crossref](#)]
393. Christoph Hanck. 2009. Cross-sectional correlation robust tests for panel cointegration. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 36:7, 817-833. [[Crossref](#)]
394. Isabelle Méjean, Cyrille Schwellnus. 2009. Price convergence in the European Union: Within firms or composition of firms?. *Journal of International Economics* 78:1, 1-10. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Ahmad Zubaidi Baharumshah, Siti Hamizah Mohd, Sung K. Ahn. 2009. On the predictive power of monetary exchange rate model: the case of the Malaysian ringgit/US dollar rate. *Applied Economics* 41:14, 1761-1770. [[Crossref](#)]
396. Yu Hsing. 2009. Modeling the Behavior of the KRW/USD Exchange Rate and Policy Implications. *Global Economic Review* 38:2, 205-214. [[Crossref](#)]
397. Jose Angelo Divino, Vladimir Kuhl Teles, Joaquim Pinto de Andrade. 2009. On the Purchasing Power Parity for Latin-American Countries. *Journal of Applied Economics* 12:1, 33-54. [[Crossref](#)]
398. Andrew K. Rose, Saktiandi Supaat, Jacob Braude. 2009. Fertility and the real exchange rate. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* 42:2, 496-518. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Armin Shmilovici, Yoav Kahiri, Irad Ben-Gal, Shmuel Hauser. 2009. Measuring the Efficiency of the Intraday Forex Market with a Universal Data Compression Algorithm. *Computational Economics* 33:2, 131-154. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Syed A. Basher, Joakim Westerlund. 2009. Panel cointegration and the monetary exchange rate model. *Economic Modelling* 26:2, 506-513. [[Crossref](#)]
401. KENNETH W. CLEMENTS, H. Y. IZAN, YIHUI LAN. 2009. A Stochastic Measure of International Competitiveness. *International Review of Finance* 9:1-2, 51-81. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Nikitas Pittis, Christina Christou, Sarantis Kalyvitis, Christis Hassapis. 2009. Long-Run PPP under the Presence of Near-to-Unit Roots: The Case of the British Pound-US Dollar Rate. *Review of International Economics* 17:1, 144-155. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Andros Gregoriou. 2009. Non-normality, heteroscedasticity and recursive unit root tests of PPP: solving the PPP puzzle?. *Applied Economics Letters* 16:3, 223-226. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Guneratne B. Wickremasinghe. 2009. Are real exchange rates of Papua New Guinea mean-reverting? Evidence from panel unit root tests. *Applied Economics Letters* 16:2, 157-161. [[Crossref](#)]
405. Venus Khim-Sen Liew, Hock-Ann Lee, Kian-Ping Lim. 2009. Purchasing power parity in Asian economies: further evidence from rank tests for cointegration. *Applied Economics Letters* 16:1, 51-54. [[Crossref](#)]
406. Gawon Yoon. 2009. Purchasing power parity and long memory. *Applied Economics Letters* 16:1, 55-61. [[Crossref](#)]

407. Paresh Kumar Narayan, Seema Narayan, Arti Prasad. 2009. Evidence on PPP from a cointegration test with multiple structural breaks. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 5-8. [[Crossref](#)]
408. Hüseyin Kalyoncu. 2009. New evidence of the validity of purchasing power parity from Turkey. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 63-67. [[Crossref](#)]
409. Nasip Bolatoglu, Funda Telatar, Erdinc Telatar. 2009. Stochastic behaviour of the real exchange rate for Jordan: a re-examination. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 81-85. [[Crossref](#)]
410. J. V. Pérez-Rodríguez, F. Ledesma-Rodríguez, S. Torra-Porras. 2009. Purchasing power parity and nonlinear adjustment. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 35-38. [[Crossref](#)]
411. Gawon Yoon. 2009. Are real exchange rates more likely to be stationary during the fixed nominal exchange rate regimes?. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 17-22. [[Crossref](#)]
412. Yu Hsing. 2009. Functional forms and PPP: new evidence for eight Asian countries. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 95-98. [[Crossref](#)]
413. Ruhul Salim, Kamrul Hassan. 2009. Does the relative population growth affect purchasing power parity?. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 103-107. [[Crossref](#)]
414. Mark P. Taylor. 2009. Editorial: Long-run purchasing power parity and real exchange rates: introduction and overview. *Applied Economics Letters* **16**:1, 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
415. Emmanuel V. Pikoulakis. 2009. The Real Exchange Rate and its Real Fundamentals: A Story of Success in a Nutshell. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
416. Robinson Kruse, Michael Froemmel, Lukas Menkhoff, Philipp Sibbertsen. 2009. What Do We Know About Real Exchange Rate Non-Linearities?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
417. Stephan Schulmeister. 2009. Asset Price Fluctuations, Financial Crises and the Stabilizing Effects of a General Transaction Tax. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
418. Carla Massidda, Paolo Mattana. 2008. Regional productivity and relative prices dynamics: the case of Italy. *The Annals of Regional Science* **42**:4, 945-966. [[Crossref](#)]
419. David O. Cushman. 2008. Long-run PPP in a system context: No favorable evidence after all for the U.S., Germany, and Japan. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* **18**:5, 413-424. [[Crossref](#)]
420. C. O. Vargas-Téllez. 2008. Purchasing power parity across Mexican cities: a panel data analysis. *Applied Economics* **40**:22, 2891-2899. [[Crossref](#)]
421. Yu Hsing. 2008. Application of Monetary Models of Exchange Rate Determination for Poland. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business* **3**:2, 19-24. [[Crossref](#)]
422. Yu Hsing. 2008. On the functional form of PPP: the case of nine new EU countries. *Applied Financial Economics Letters* **4**:6, 389-393. [[Crossref](#)]
423. Yamin S. Ahmad. 2008. The effects of small sample bias in Threshold Autoregressive models. *Economics Letters* **101**:1, 6-8. [[Crossref](#)]
424. Rakesh K. Bissoondecal. 2008. Post-Bretton Woods evidence on PPP under different exchange rate regimes. *Applied Financial Economics* **18**:18, 1481-1488. [[Crossref](#)]
425. Geping Wang. The Theoretical Analyses of Fixed and Floating Exchange Rates 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
426. James R. Lothian, Mark P. Taylor. 2008. Real Exchange Rates Over the Past Two Centuries: How Important is the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson Effect?. *The Economic Journal* **118**:532, 1742-1763. [[Crossref](#)]
427. H. Herwartz, F. Siedenburg. 2008. Homogenous panel unit root tests under cross sectional dependence: Finite sample modifications and the wild bootstrap. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **53**:1, 137-150. [[Crossref](#)]

428. Yi-Chung Hsu, Chien-Chiang Lee, Chi-Chuan Lee. 2008. Revisited: Are shocks to energy consumption permanent or temporary? New evidence from a panel SURADF approach. *Energy Economics* 30:5, 2314-2330. [[Crossref](#)]
429. Roxana Barrantes, Hernan Galperin. 2008. Can the poor afford mobile telephony? Evidence from Latin America. *Telecommunications Policy* 32:8, 521-530. [[Crossref](#)]
430. Imed Drine, Christophe Rault. 2008. PURCHASING POWER PARITY FOR DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM NON-STATIONARY PANEL DATA MODELS?. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 22:4, 752-773. [[Crossref](#)]
431. I-Ming Chiu. 2008. An Empirical Study on the Long-Run Determinants of Exchange Rate. *Review of Pacific Basin Financial Markets and Policies* 11:03, 389-409. [[Crossref](#)]
432. Momtchil Pojarliev, Richard M. Levich. 2008. Do Professional Currency Managers Beat the Benchmark?. *Financial Analysts Journal* 64:5, 18-32. [[Crossref](#)]
433. Jyh-Lin Wu, Pei-Fen Chen. 2008. A revisit on dissecting the PPP puzzle: Evidence from a nonlinear approach. *Economic Modelling* 25:4, 684-695. [[Crossref](#)]
434. Lukas Menkhoff, Rafael R. Rebitzky. 2008. Investor sentiment in the US-dollar: Longer-term, non-linear orientation on PPP. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 15:3, 455-467. [[Crossref](#)]
435. Kenneth Clements, Yihui Lan, John Roberts. 2008. Exchange-rate economics for the resources sector. *Resources Policy* 33:2, 102-117. [[Crossref](#)]
436. MICHAEL SAGER, MARK P. TAYLOR. 2008. Commercially Available Order Flow Data and Exchange Rate Movements: Caveat Emptor. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 40:4, 583-625. [[Crossref](#)]
437. David O. Cushman. 2008. Real exchange rates may have nonlinear trends. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 13:2, 158-173. [[Crossref](#)]
438. Nikolaos Mylonidis, Dimitrios Sideris. 2008. Home bias and purchasing power parity: evidence from the G-7 countries. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 13:2, 199-204. [[Crossref](#)]
439. Doireann Fitzgerald. 2008. Can trade costs explain why exchange rate volatility does not feed into consumer prices?. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 55:3, 606-628. [[Crossref](#)]
440. Paresch Kumar Narayan, Biman Chand Prasad. 2008. Are shocks to real effective exchange rates permanent or transitory? Evidence from Pacific Island countries. *Applied Economics* 40:8, 1053-1060. [[Crossref](#)]
441. Roberto Frenkel, Martín Rapetti. 2008. Five years of competitive and stable real exchange rate in Argentina, 2002-2007. *International Review of Applied Economics* 22:2, 215-226. [[Crossref](#)]
442. Zeynel Abidin Ozdemir. 2008. The purchasing power parity hypothesis in Turkey: evidence from nonlinear STAR error correction models. *Applied Economics Letters* 15:4, 307-311. [[Crossref](#)]
443. Vishal C. Jaunky. 2008. The real exchange rate and productivity differentials: a panel cointegration approach. *Applied Economics Letters* 15:4, 313-318. [[Crossref](#)]
444. Gianpaolo Rossini, Paolo Zanghieri. 2008. What Drives Price Differentials of Consumables in Europe? Size? Affluence? Or Both?. *Open Economies Review* 19:1, 121-134. [[Crossref](#)]
445. Katja Funke, Isabell Koske. 2008. Does the Law of One Price Hold within the EU? A Panel Analysis. *International Advances in Economic Research* 14:1, 11-24. [[Crossref](#)]
446. Lukas Menkhoff, Rafael R. Rebitzky, Michael Schröder. 2008. Do dollar forecasters believe too much in PPP?. *Applied Economics* 40:3, 261-270. [[Crossref](#)]
447. Olivier Darné, Jean-François Hoarau. 2008. The purchasing power parity in Australia: evidence from unit root test with structural break. *Applied Economics Letters* 15:3, 203-206. [[Crossref](#)]

448. Jyh-Lin Wu, Chien-Chiang Lee. 2008. A revisit to the nonlinear stationarity of real exchange rates. *Applied Economics Letters* 15:2, 155-159. [[Crossref](#)]
449. Lein-Lein Chen, Seungmook Choi, John Devereux. 2008. Have Absolute Price Levels Converged for Developed Economies? The Evidence since 1870. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 90:1, 29-36. [[Crossref](#)]
450. Tsangyao Chang, Wen-Chi Liu. 2008. Long-run purchasing power parity with asymmetric adjustment: evidence from nine major oil-exporting countries. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 38, n/a-n/a. [[Crossref](#)]
451. Su Zhou. 2008. Stationarity of Asian-Pacific real exchange rates. *Economics Letters* 98:1, 16-22. [[Crossref](#)]
452. Lucio Sarno. Purchasing Power Parity 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
453. Menzie D. Chinn. Real Exchange Rates 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
454. Ahmad Zubaidi Baharumshah, Chan Tze-Haw, Stilianos Fountas. 2008. Re-examining purchasing power parity for East-Asian currencies: 1976-2002. *Applied Financial Economics* 18:1, 75-85. [[Crossref](#)]
455. Mark P. Taylor, Hyeyoen Kim. 2008. 4 Real Variables, Nonlinearity, and European Real Exchange Rates. *NBER International Seminar on Macroeconomics* 5:1, 157-193. [[Crossref](#)]
456. Olaf Korn, Philipp Koziol. 2008. The Term Structure of Currency Hedge Ratios. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
457. Luciana Juvenal, Mark P. Taylor. 2008. Threshold Adjustment in Deviations from the Law of One Price. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
458. Stephan Schulmeister. 2008. A General Financial Transaction Tax Motives, Revenues, Feasibility and Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
459. António Afonso, Christophe Rault. 2008. Fiscal Sustainability in the EU: A Panel Data Diagnostic. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
460. Duo Qin. 2008. Uncover Latent PPP by Dynamic Factor Error Correction Model (DF-ECM) Approach: Evidence from Five OECD Countries. *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal* 2:2008-7, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
461. Olivier Darné, Jean-François Hoarau. 2008. La parité des pouvoirs d'achat pour l'économie chinoise : une nouvelle analyse par les tests de racine unitaire. *Recherches économiques de Louvain* 74:2, 219. [[Crossref](#)]
462. Gabriel Rodríguez, Indira Romero. 2007. The role of permanent and transitory components in the fluctuations of Latin-American real exchange rates. *Applied Economics* 39:21, 2713-2722. [[Crossref](#)]
463. JANI BEKŮ, DARJA BORŠIČ. 2007. Purchasing Power Parity in Transition Economies: Does It Hold in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia?. *Post-Communist Economies* 19:4, 417-432. [[Crossref](#)]
464. Bernd Schnatz. 2007. Is reversion to PPP in euro exchange rates non-linear?. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 4:3, 281-297. [[Crossref](#)]
465. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Hanafia Harvey. 2007. Real and Nominal Effective Exchange Rates for LDCs: 1971-2004. *The International Trade Journal* 21:4, 385-416. [[Crossref](#)]
466. Lukas Menkhoff, Mark P. Taylor. 2007. The Obstinate Passion of Foreign Exchange Professionals: Technical Analysis. *Journal of Economic Literature* 45:4, 936-972. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]



467. Mario Cerrato, Nicholas Sarantis. 2007. Does purchasing power parity hold in emerging markets? Evidence from a panel of black market exchange rates. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 12:4, 427-444. [[Crossref](#)]
468. Paresh Kumar Narayan, Seema Narayan. 2007. Are real exchange rates nonlinear with a unit root? Evidence on PPP for Italy: a note. *Applied Economics* 39:19, 2483-2488. [[Crossref](#)]
469. Mohsen Bahmani Oskooee, Magda Kandil. 2007. Real and nominal effective exchange rates in MENA countries: 1970–2004. *Applied Economics* 39:19, 2489-2501. [[Crossref](#)]
470. Olivier Darné, Jean-François Hoarau. 2007. FURTHER EVIDENCE ON MEAN REVERSION IN THE AUSTRALIAN EXCHANGE RATE. *Bulletin of Economic Research* 59:4, 383-395. [[Crossref](#)]
471. Lean Hooi Hooi, Russell Smyth. 2007. Are Asian real exchange rates mean reverting? Evidence from univariate and panel LM unit root tests with one and two structural breaks. *Applied Economics* 39:16, 2109-2120. [[Crossref](#)]
472. Yu Hsing. 2007. Exchange rate fluctuations in Croatia: test of uncovered interest rate parity and the open economy model. *Applied Economics Letters* 14:11, 785-788. [[Crossref](#)]
473. Ekaterini Panopoulou. 2007. PPP over a century: cointegration and structural change. *Applied Financial Economics Letters* 3:5, 319-325. [[Crossref](#)]
474. Pär Sjölander. 2007. Unreal exchange rates: a simulation-based approach to adjust misleading PPP estimates. *Journal of Economic Studies* 34:3, 256-288. [[Crossref](#)]
475. Jaehun Chung, Yongmiao Hong. 2007. Model-free evaluation of directional predictability in foreign exchange markets. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 22:5, 855-889. [[Crossref](#)]
476. Stuart Landon, Constance E. Smith. 2007. Government debt spillovers in a monetary union. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* 18:2, 135-154. [[Crossref](#)]
477. Ming-Yuan Leon Li. 2007. Purchasing power parity under high and low volatility regimes. *Applied Economics Letters* 14:8, 581-589. [[Crossref](#)]
478. Mohsen Bahmani-Oskooee, Abera Gelan. 2007. Real and nominal effective exchange rates for African countries. *Applied Economics* 39:8, 961-979. [[Crossref](#)]
479. Charalambos Pattichis, Marios Maratheftis, Stavros A. Zenios. 2007. Is the Cyprus Pound Real Effective Exchange Rate Misaligned? A BEER Approach. *International Economic Journal* 21:1, 133-154. [[Crossref](#)]
480. Chikashi Tsuji. 2007. Explaining the dynamics of the NIKKEI 225 stock and stock index futures markets by using the SETAR model. *Applied Financial Economics Letters* 3:2, 77-83. [[Crossref](#)]
481. Derek Bond, Michael J. Harrison, Edward J. O'Brien. 2007. Exploring Nonlinearity with Random Field Regression. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
482. Momtchil T. Pojarliev, Richard M. Levich. 2007. Do Professional Currency Managers Beat the Benchmark?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
483. Christophe Rault, Antonio Afonso. 2007. What Do We Really Know about Fiscal Sustainability in the EU? A Panel Data Diagnostic. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
484. Kenneth W. Clements, H. Y. Izan, Yihui Lan. 2007. A Stochastic Measure of International Competitiveness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
485. Jen-Chi Cheng, Larry Taylor, Wenlong Weng. 2007. Exchange rates and prices: revisiting Granger causality tests. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics* 29:2, 259-283. [[Crossref](#)]
486. Tsangyao Chang, Hsu-Ling Chang, Hsiao-Ping Chu, Chi-Wei Su. 2006. Is per capita real GDP stationary in African countries? Evidence from panel SURADF test. *Applied Economics Letters* 13:15, 1003-1008. [[Crossref](#)]

487. Yu Hsing. 2006. Responses of output in Poland to shocks to the exchange rate, the stock price, and other macroeconomic variables: a VAR model. *Applied Economics Letters* 13:15, 1017-1022. [[Crossref](#)]
488. Tsangyao Chang, Hsu-Ling Chang, Hsiao-Ping Chu, Chi-Wei Su. 2006. Does PPP hold in African countries? Further evidence based on a highly dynamic non-linear (logistic) unit root test. *Applied Economics* 38:20, 2453-2459. [[Crossref](#)]
489. Lucio Sarno, Giorgio Valente. 2006. Deviations from purchasing power parity under different exchange rate regimes: Do they revert and, if so, how?. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 30:11, 3147-3169. [[Crossref](#)]
490. Paul R. Bergin, Reuven Glick, Alan M. Taylor. 2006. Productivity, tradability, and the long-run price puzzle. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 53:8, 2041-2066. [[Crossref](#)]
491. C. Simon Fan, Xiangdong Wei. 2006. The Law of One Price: Evidence from the Transitional Economy of China. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 88:4, 682-697. [[Crossref](#)]
492. Sang-Kuck Chung. 2006. The out-of-sample forecasts of nonlinear long-memory models of the real exchange rate. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 11:4, 355-370. [[Crossref](#)]
493. Frederick H. Wallace, Gary L. Shelley. 2006. An alternative test of purchasing power parity. *Economics Letters* 92:2, 177-183. [[Crossref](#)]
494. Alexander Mende, Lukas Menkhoff. 2006. Profits and speculation in intra-day foreign exchange trading. *Journal of Financial Markets* 9:3, 223-245. [[Crossref](#)]
495. Yu Hsing. 2006. Analysis of Short-term Exchange Rate Movements in Korea: Application of an Extended Mundell-Fleming Model. *Global Economic Review* 35:2, 145-151. [[Crossref](#)]
496. Daiki Maki. 2006. Variance ratio tests for a unit root in the presence of a mean shift: small sample properties and an application to purchasing power parity. *Applied Financial Economics* 16:8, 607-615. [[Crossref](#)]
497. Marie Arneberg, Einar Bowitz. 2006. Who Is the Big Spender? Price Index Effects in Comparisons of Educational Expenditures Between Countries and Over Time. *Peabody Journal of Education* 81:2, 33-46. [[Crossref](#)]
498. Kees G. Koedijk, James R. Lothian, Mathijs A. van Dijk. 2006. Foreign exchange markets: Overview of the special issue. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 25:1, 1-6. [[Crossref](#)]
499. Paresch Kumar Narayan. 2006. Are bilateral real exchange rates stationary? Evidence from Lagrange multiplier unit root tests for India. *Applied Economics* 38:1, 63-70. [[Crossref](#)]
500. Michael J. Sager, Mark P. Taylor. 2006. Under the microscope: the structure of the foreign exchange market. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 11:1, 81-95. [[Crossref](#)]
501. Jerry Coakley, Stuart Snaith. 2006. Testing for symmetry and proportionality in a European panel. *Applied Financial Economics* 16:1-2, 63-71. [[Crossref](#)]
502. Mark P. Taylor. 2006. Real exchange rates and Purchasing Power Parity: mean-reversion in economic thought. *Applied Financial Economics* 16:1-2, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
503. Mohammad S. Hasan. 2006. A century of Purchasing Power Parity: evidence from Canada and Australia. *Applied Financial Economics* 16:1-2, 145-156. [[Crossref](#)]
504. Dimitrios Sideris. 2006. Purchasing Power Parity in economies in transition: evidence from Central and East European countries. *Applied Financial Economics* 16:1-2, 135-143. [[Crossref](#)]
505. Michael Sager. 2006. Explaining the persistence of deviations from PPP: a non-linear Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect?. *Applied Financial Economics* 16:1-2, 41-61. [[Crossref](#)]
506. Philip Hans Franses, Dick van Dijk. 2006. A simple test for PPP among traded goods. *Applied Financial Economics* 16:1-2, 19-27. [[Crossref](#)]

507. Pan A. Yotopoulos, Yasuyuki Sawada. 2006. Exchange rate misalignment: a new test of long-run PPP based on cross-country data. *Applied Financial Economics* **16**:1-2, 127-134. [[Crossref](#)]
508. Jean-Francois Villeneuve, Jagdish Handa. 2006. Purchasing Power Parity as a long-term memory process: evidence from Canada. *Applied Financial Economics* **16**:1-2, 109-117. [[Crossref](#)]
509. Konstantin Gluschenko. 2006. Biases in Cross-Space Comparisons Through Cross-Time Price Indexes: The Case of Russia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
510. Paolo Zanghieri, Gianpaolo Rossini. 2006. What Drives Price Differentials of Consumables in Europe?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
511. David T. Mitchell, Robert Rebelein, Patricia Higino H. Schneider, Nicole B. Simpson, Eric O'Neill Fisher. 2006. A Classroom Experiment on Exchange Rate Determination with Purchasing Power Parity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
512. Guneratne B. Wickremasinghe. 2005. Purchasing Power Parity of Papua New Guinea: evidence from the floating exchange rate regime. *Applied Financial Economics Letters* **1**:6, 335-338. [[Crossref](#)]
513. Kim Abildgren. 2005. Real effective exchange rates and purchasing-power-parity convergence: Empirical evidence for Denmark, 1875-2002. *Scandinavian Economic History Review* **53**:3, 58-70. [[Crossref](#)]
514. Jerry Coakley, Neil Kellard, Stuart Snaith. 2005. The PPP debate: Price matters!. *Economics Letters* **88**:2, 209-213. [[Crossref](#)]
515. Lucio Sarno. 2005. Viewpoint: Towards a solution to the puzzles in exchange rate economics: where do we stand?. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* **38**:3, 673-708. [[Crossref](#)]
516. Jerry Coakley \*, Stuart Snaith. 2005. Testing for symmetry and proportionality in a European panel. *Applied Financial Economics* **15**:11, 745-752. [[Crossref](#)]
517. Paresh Kumar Narayan. 2005. New evidence on purchasing power parity from 17 OECD countries. *Applied Economics* **37**:9, 1063-1071. [[Crossref](#)]
518. Imed Drine, Christophe Rault \*. 2005. Can the Balassa-Samuelson theory explain long-run real exchange rate movements in OECD countries?. *Applied Financial Economics* **15**:8, 519-530. [[Crossref](#)]
519. Jerry Coakley, Robert P. Flood, Ana M. Fuertes, Mark P. Taylor. 2005. Purchasing power parity and the theory of general relativity: the first tests. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **24**:2, 293-316. [[Crossref](#)]
520. Guglielmo Maria Caporale \*, Mario Cerrato, Nicola Spagnolo. 2005. Measuring half-lives: using a non-parametric bootstrap approach. *Applied Financial Economics Letters* **1**:1, 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
521. Borja Larrain. 2005. The Stock Market and Cross Country Differences in Relative Prices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]