

Exchange Rate Misalignment in Pakistan: Evidence from Purchasing Power Parity Theory

By

1 Dr Abdul Qayyum
Associate Professor,
Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad

2. Muhammad Arshad Khan,
Associate Professor
Government Postgraduate College Muzaffarabad, Azad Kashmir

3. Dr Khair-u-Zaman
Professor
Gomal University, D. I. Khan

Abstract:

This paper examines the validity of the purchasing power parity to evaluate whether the Pak rupee was overvalued since the introduction of managed floating exchange rate. The Johansen multivariate cointegration technique is applied for the period 1982Q2-2002Q4. A single cointegrating vector is identified whose coefficients conform in broad terms to the restriction implied by the PPP theory, lending support to the interpretation of the model as describing a long-run relationship. This support is reinforced by the results derived from the adjustment coefficient, which identify as clear short-run tendency for the exchange rate to revert to the equilibrium value defined by the estimated long-run model. Furthermore, exchange rate misalignment is also calculated from the estimated long-run relationship to evaluate whether Pak rupee was overvalued since the inception of managed floating exchange rate system. Calculated misalignment shows substantial overvaluation of Pak rupee vis-à-vis US dollar

Exchange Rate Misalignment in Pakistan: Evidence from Purchasing Power Parity Theory

Introduction

Exchange rate provides a key link between the domestic and world markets for goods and assets. Therefore, a proper and detailed analysis of the behaviour of exchange rate is required. There is also growing agreement that prolonged and substantial exchange rate misalignment can create severe macroeconomic disequilibria and the correction of external balance will require both exchange rate devaluation and demand management policies. Thus PPP theory has been used by the policymakers as a guide to represent the external competitiveness of a country, and as a benchmark against which floating exchange rates are judged to be misaligned. Developments in 1990s and 2000s show that cost associated with exchange rate misalignment is very high. Hence, the analysis of exchange rate determination in the presence of exchange rate misalignment is crucial for the policy purpose because of its role as a component of an early warning system (Berg et al, 2000)

It is not easy to set nominal exchange rate in its intended path. There are conceptual and empirical issues that what exactly the value of long-run equilibrium exchange rate. In the literature, there are at least three broad definitions of misalignment (Williamson, 1994; Miles-Feretti and Raziun, 1996 and Hinkle and Monteil, 1999). First, Price-based criteria, such as purchasing power parity (PPP) and its variants. Second, model-based criteria, based on the formal models of nominal exchange rates. Third, sustainability-based criteria, which make reference to trends in the current account and the external debts to GDP ratio. Price-based criteria is easy to implement and has strong

operational advantages¹. Therefore, in this study a more modest goal of implementing the price-based criteria is set forth.

Purchasing power parity constitutes one of the fundamental building block in modeling the modern theories of exchange rate determination.² This theory was originally advanced by Cassel (1916, 1918), asserts that under the conditions of free trade³ the nominal exchange rate between two countries is equal to the ratio of the two countries price level. This approach assumes that equilibrium real exchange rates remain constant over time and therefore, the nominal exchange rate movement tends to offset relative price movements.⁴ The PPP hypothesis postulates that exchange rates adjust to price differentials in open economies to restore international commodity market equilibrium. Basically, PPP theory relies on law of one price (LOP)⁵ in an integrated, competitive product market with an implicit assumption of a risk-neutral world. The concept is based on a flow theory of exchange rates⁶ where the demand for currency is to pay for exports

¹ The implementation of model-based and sustainability-based criterion require more detailed analysis. Especially, the sustainability-based measures are very difficult to calculate as they require a fully-fleshed out macroeconomic model. PPP-based analysis can be used to make initial diagnoses and for identifying hypothesis for analyzing more detailed models.

² The flexible-price monetary exchange rate model developed by Frenkel (1976) and Bilson (1978) presumes that PPP hold continuously, the Dornbusch's (1976) Sticky-price and the Frankel (1979) real interest rate differential models assumes that PPP hold in the long-run only. However, the poor performance of these models required the analysis of their underlying components, including PPP, to be tested for validity (Bhatti, 1996).

³ Transaction costs, capital flows and speculative expectations are absent.

⁴ Although the assumption of free trade, absence of transport costs and speculative flows are unrealistic in the real world and the exchange rate may deviate from its PPP level and real exchange rate from its mean values.

⁵ Law of one price states that when measured in a common currency, free traded commodities should cost the same everywhere under perfect market setting assumption (i.e. no transaction costs, no tax, homogeneous goods and complete certainty). If the prices deviate from each other, then the commodity arbitragers would capitalized by buying in one market and selling in another until the profitable opportunities cease to exist.

⁶ PPP is called the flow model since it trace the flow of goods and services through the current account to determine the exchange rate.

and the supply is to pay for imports. Despite the fact that the theory has been known for centuries, PPP remains controversial as ever.⁷

An extensive research has been carried out, *inter alia*, by Taylor (1988), Giovannetti (1989), Patel (1990), Nachane and Chrissanthaki (1991), Crowder (1992), Sarantis and Stewart (1993), MacDonald (1993), Cooper (1994), Corbae and Ovliaris (1988), Arderi and Lubin (1991), Dornbusch (1988) and Moosa and Bhatti (1996) investigating the validity of PPP theory during the current system of floating exchange rates. But these studies have not found evidence in support of the hypothesis as a long-run hypothesis.⁸ As far as Pakistan is concerned, Bhatti (1996), Liew et al (2004), Tang and Butiong (1994) and Ahmed and F.N. Khan (2002) found supportive evidence while Chishti and Hasan (1993) found evidence which does not support the PPP hypothesis.

The main objective of the study is to test the validity of PPP theory of exchange rate determination and to evaluate whether PPP is valid criteria for calculating misalignment in Pakistan for 1982Q2 to 2002Q4. The study is organized in the following manner. In section 2, the price-based measure of misalignment is described. Section 3 discusses the theoretical model of PPP. Data, econometric methodology and empirical evidence are discussed in section 4. Exchange rate misalignment is calculated in section 4, while some concluding remarks are given in the final section.

2. Price-based Criteria Price of Equilibrium Exchange Rate

Purchasing power parity theory of exchange rate determination asserts that the exchange rate between two currencies over any period of time is determined by the changes in the two countries price levels. This theory signals out changes in price levels

⁷ Much of the theory is reviewed and discussed by officer (1984), Dornbusch (1988) and Levich (1998).

⁸ It must be noted that the majority of studies conducted to date have been on developed countries and a limited number on high inflation developing countries.

as the overriding determinant in the determination of exchange rate. According to this theory, exchange rate may diverge from its PPP level in the short-run. There are several reasons that why deviations from PPP occur. Firstly, there may be restrictions on trade and capital movements which will distort the relationship between home and foreign prices. Secondly, speculative activities and official intervention may create a PPP disparity. Thirdly, the productivity bias when there is a relatively faster productivity growth in the tradable sector than the non-tradable sector will result in systematic divergence of internal prices (Balassa, 1964 and Chinn, 2000). Fourthly, the prices are sticky and do not move rapidly enough to offset frequently changes in nominal exchange rates. Lastly, the apparent non-stationarity of real exchange rate will be consistent with prevalence of real shocks in the economy. Moreover, an important shocks during the past two decades include large commodity price changes, innovations in the financial sector, imbalance in government budget, differentials in productivity growth among major industrial countries, etc. (Arndt and Richardson, 1987) also generate short-run deviations from PPP.

3. Purchasing Power Parity: Theoretical Model

The purchasing power parity theory serve as an equilibrium condition in the theory of exchange rate determination and in exchange rate policy. This theory is still frequently used to determine the link between exchange rate and relative prices⁹. The building block of PPP is the law of one price. For any good, in the absence of quotas,

⁹ Many countries undertake corrective measures of their exchange rates based on inflation differentials with partner countries. While fundamental equilibrium exchange rates (FEERs), derived from medium term internal/external macroeconomic balance conditions, are becoming more and more attractive for detecting misalignment in a country's real exchange rate (Clark et al, 1994), PPPs remain much easier to compute. Moreover, deviations between FEERs and PPPs have not yet been analyzed in empirical studies.

tariffs and other impediments to trade, trade and effective arbitrage in goods markets should ensure identical price across countries. The law of one price is stated as:

$$P_i = S.P_i^* \quad (1)$$

Here P_i is the price of good i expressed in domestic currency, P_i^* is the price of good i expressed in foreign currency and S is the nominal exchange rate expressed in unit of local currency per one unit of foreign currency. When aggregated over all goods, the law of one price yields the purchasing power parity, which is stated as

$$P_t = S_t.P_t^* \quad (2)$$

Here P is the price level in the home country and P^* is the price level in the foreign country. Equation (2) is known as absolute PPP. It is known that transportation costs, tariffs and non-tariff barriers will entail market segmentation and create a wedge among price across countries. However, if these factors remain constant over time, PPP can be restated, using a positive constant B^{10} , as:

$$P_t = B(SP^*)_t \quad (3)$$

In logarithmic form it can be expressed as

$$p_t = \beta_0 + s_t + p_t^* \quad (4)$$

Rearranging equation (4) gives the strong or absolute form of the PPP

$$s_t = \beta_0 + (p - p^*)_t + \mu_t \quad (5)$$

¹⁰ In contrast, relative PPP refers to the relationship between relative change in nominal exchange rate and the differential in relative changes in price levels, that is, $\frac{\Delta s}{s} = \frac{\Delta p}{p} - \frac{\Delta p^*}{p^*}$, or in logarithmic form

$$\Delta s = \Delta p - \Delta p^* .$$

Where s_t , p and p^* are the natural log of nominal exchange rate, domestic and foreign price indices respectively while μ_t is the error term¹¹. This version of PPP is based on the law of one price, which states that the price of a common basket of goods in the two countries, measured in a common currency will be the same at all time because of costless spatial arbitrage.

The testable version of PPP is expressed as:

$$s_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1(p - p^*)_t + \mu_t \quad (6)$$

Where β_0 is the logarithm of the exchange rate observed in the base period. In equation (6), the presence of a constant term β_0 is justified by Krichene (1998) on two grounds. First, since transportation costs, tariff and non-tariff barriers entail markets segmentation and create a wedge among prices across countries. Second, the use of a constant also necessary when prices are in terms of indices.

PPP holds in the long-run if the restrictions $(\beta_0, \beta_1) = (0, 1)$ cannot be rejected. Moreover, an equilibrium relationship exists when exchange rate and relative prices are cointegrated. Further, if exchange rate changes over time but is stationary ARIMA (p, q) process, then the deviations from parity is largely temporary and are expected to disappear through time. Although, one-to-one proportionality restrictions seems to be implausible and unrealistic in practice when transport costs, other trade impediments and measurement errors are allowed. Taylor (1988) and Sercu et al. (1995) demonstrates that in the presence of transport costs and measurement errors in the price variables, the proportionality may still hold, but it will not necessarily equal to unity (i.e. $\beta_1 \neq 1$).

¹¹ Logarithm of constant B is β_0

4. Data, Econometric Methodology and Empirical Evidence

We utilized quarterly data ranging from 1982 Q2-2002Q4. The exchange rate (s_t) was the end of period nominal rate measured in terms of units of domestic currency per US dollar. Data on relative prices $(p-p^*)_t$ were calculated on the basis of wholesale price index¹² and were obtained from the IFS CD-ROM. Before conducting the analysis of long-run relationship between exchange rate and relative prices, we first test the order of integration of the stochastic variables by employing the augmented Dickey-Fuller (1979) unit root tests. Table 1 reports the augmented Dickey-Fuller test results¹³.

Table 1: Unit Root Tests

Series	Log-Level		Log-first Difference	
	C	C & T	C	C & T
s_t	-0.4692(0)	-2.443(0)	-8.485(0)**	-8.432(0)**
$(p_t - p^*_t)$	-0.7231(3)	-1.502(3)	-3.743(2)**	-3.570(2)*
Critical Values				
1%	-3.52	-4.08		
5%	-2.90	-3.47		

** and * indicate significant at 1% and 5% levels respectively.

These results indicate that the series s_t and $(p_t - p^*_t)$ are I(1) in their log-level and I(0) in their log-first difference. Since both series, which would enter the PPP formulation, are integrated of the same order, hence it is possible to test for the presence of cointegration.

¹² We used (WPI) whole sale price indices (1995=100) for both Pakistan and U.S. because the relative prices based on the consumer price indices (CPI) seems to be I(2) i.e. $(p-p^*)_t \sim I(2)$ while the exchange rate $s_t \sim I(1)$.

¹³ These unit root test results carried out by including linear trend and constant and constant only.

The test for the presence of cointegration is performed using Johansen (1988) and Johansen and Juselius (1990) multivariate cointegration method. Two lags were selected for VAR following the Likelihood ratio statistic adjusted for degrees of freedom. Moreover, the VAR model includes restricted intercepts and no trend. Table 2 reports the maximal eigenvalue ($\lambda - \max$) and trace ($\lambda - \text{trace}$) statistics of the underlying VAR.

Table 2: Cointegration Analysis of the PPP Hypothesis
Series $[s_t, (p - p^*)_t]$ and lags = 2

Eigenvalues	0.31534	0.050444
Hypothesis	$r=0$	$r \leq 1$
$\lambda - \max$	31.06(0.000)**	4.24(0.388)
$\lambda - \text{trace}$	35.31(0.000)**	4.24(0.389)
$\lambda - \max(T - nm) +$	29.55(0.000)**	4.04(0.418)
$\lambda - \text{trace}(T - nm) +$	33.59(0.000)**	4.04(0.419)
Panel B:	Standardized Eigenvector (β')	
s_t	1.0000	-0.85630
$(p - p^*)_t$	-1.1031	1.0000
<i>constant</i>	-3.9206	3.0597
Panel C:	Standardized Adjustment Coefficient (α)	
s_t	-0.072218	0.050583
$(p - p^*)_t$	-0.026476	-0.046840

** indicate 99% level of significant. The critical values are taken from Pesaran *et al* (2000).

+ The $\lambda - \max$ and $\lambda - \text{trace}$ are maximum eigenvalue and trace statistics, adjusted for degrees of freedom

It may be noted that the exchange rate and price series reveal strong evidence of cointegration using either of the two statistics. The results also indicate the existence of a unique cointegrating vector. The presence of a single cointegrating vector confirms the long-run relationship between the nominal exchange rate and relative prices over the

sample period 1982Q2-2004Q4. Thus, we set a considerable support for the so-called weak-form PPP which purports that exchange rate and price levels are cointegrated to produce stationary residuals. In order to examine the strong form of PPP, the maximum likelihood estimates of the normalized cointegrating vector was obtained by imposing exactly-identifying restrictions on the identified cointegrating vector. Moreover, the proportionality restriction has also been tested by imposing over-identifying restrictions on the parameters.¹⁴ The results are presented in table 3.

Table 3: Testing for coefficients Restrictions

$$(s_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1(p - p^*)_t + \mu_t)$$

Panel A: Coefficients and Coefficient Restrictions			
β_0	3.9206	(0.061541)	
β_1	1.1031	(0.084401)**	
LL	393.580727		
$\chi^2(\beta_0=0)$	4.4805**		
$\chi^2(\beta_1=1)$	0.9134		
$\chi^2(\beta_0, \beta_1)=(0,1)$	4.8021		
Panel B: Coefficient Restrictions and Weak Exogeneity (Standardized β' eigenvectors and $\alpha = A\theta$ coefficients)			
	s_t	$(p - p^*)_t$	<i>constant</i>
β'	1.0000	-1.0000	0.0000
α	-0.0061597 (0.0014462)**	0.0000	0.0000
LR- Test of Restrictions, Rank=1: $\chi^2(3) = 16.316 (0.0010)**$			

** indicate significant at the 99% level. Figures in parentheses indicate standard errors.

¹⁴ These restrictions have been tested by employing Johansen (1988, 1991) maximum likelihood ratio test.

These results indicate that all the coefficients possess expected signs and are significant at the 5 percent level of significant. Furthermore, the results of the coefficient restrictions test reveal that PPP hold reasonably well, lend strong support for the validity of PPP hypothesis as a long-run relationship. Our results are consistent with the previous results obtained by Bhatti (1996) and Tang and Butiong (1994) for Pakistan. Further, the adjustment coefficients (panel C, table 2) for nominal exchange rate and the relative price level are negative and significant, indicating that both variables adjust to correct the deviations from long-run equilibrium position. However, exchange rate is adjusted faster than the changes in relative prices towards the long-run equilibrium.


Panel B of table 3 present the results of testing jointly the existence of a single cointegrating vector and long-run weak exogeneity of the variables s_t and $(p - p^*)_t$ for the parameters in the PPP equation, which are constrained for the long-run proportionality of the exchange rate and relative prices. This implies a single row in the β' matrix and a single column in the α matrix of the form $(*, 0, 0)$. The restrictions do not accepted by the data at the 5% level of significant. This result implies that both variables adjust to correct the deviations from long-run equilibrium position.

5. An Estimation of Equilibrium Exchange Rate

Recently, a huge literature has been developed around testing equilibrium exchange rate relationship (see Williamson, 1994; MacDonald, 1995, Hinkle and Monteil, 1999 and McDonald, 2000). Increasingly, both practitioners and policymakers have been using such relationship to address the issue of exchange rate misalignment. Chinn (2000), Husted and McDonald (1999) and La Cour and McDonald (2000) assessed whether some currencies are overvalued or undervalued against US dollar or Japanese

Yen before the 1997 Asian crisis. In this study we used identified cointegration vector to generate equilibrium exchange rate and misalignment is then calculated as a residual between actual and generated equilibrium exchange rate. Figure 1 reports the implied misalignment for the period 1995Q1 to 2002Q4. These results indicate that throughout

Figure 1: WPI-based Exchange Rate Misalignment ($\hat{s}_t - s_t$)



Period Pakistan's rupee appeared to overvalued against US dollar. However, the magnitude of overvaluation varies over time and depending upon the estimation of equilibrium rate. This measure of misalignment gives us about 27% overvaluation in December 2002.

6. Conclusions

In this study we have tested the validity of purchasing power parity hypothesis and exchange rate misalignment for Pakistan over the period 1982Q2 -2002Q4. From the empirical analysis we can derived a number of important conclusions. *First*, the nominal exchange rate is cointegrated with WPI ratio. The cointegration coefficient between nominal exchange rate and the WPI-based price ratio is close to one. Furthermore, the coefficient restrictions are tested using Johansen maximum likelihood ratio statistic, lend support for the validity of the WPI-bases PPP. This finding is quite consistent in view of Pakistan's heavy reliance on the western developed countries for her economic development. In fact, Pakistan has been persuing trade and exchange rate liberalization policies from the late 1980s. Through reforms, Pakistan has successfully eliminated most price controls and liberalized trade. These trade and exchange liberalization policies allowed the law of one price to work more efficiently as shown by the supportive evidence of PPP. Further, the nominal exchange rate has adjusted to inflation differential. Monetary shocks, reflected in terms of high inflation rate have been neutralized over the long-run. The short-run deviation from PPP has frequently occurred, but the long-run validity of absolute PPP could not be rejected. The adjustment coefficient is negative and significant. However, the size of this coefficient is small indicating that the speed of adjustment is very slow. *Second*, these results suggest that trade has played a strong role in re-establishing international competitiveness. *Third*, even large real shocks have not had a lasting impact on competitiveness, owing to similar economic growth pattern and absence of persistent productivity differentials. The economic reforms have helped to increase the flexibility of prices and nominal exchange rates in adjusting to short-term

deviations and shortened the time period required for dampening these deviations¹⁵. Fourthly, the exchange rate remained overvalued vis-à-vis US dollar since the adoption of managed floating exchange rate system. *Finally*, the predictive power of these findings implies that exchange rate misalignment relative to PPP would eventually be corrected through commensurate movements in nominal exchange rates.

From the above discussions we can derive the following policy implications:

- *First*, macroeconomic and structural policies should help to converge along the same line as those of its partners. Further, the economic reforms help to enhanced economic efficiency and trade. Moreover, the elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers also helps to foster private sector development and enhance economic growth.
- *Second*, there is a close relationship between the monetary approach to the balance of payments and PPP. By managing real exchange rates and re-establish international competitiveness reversing losses in foreign exchange reserves and even rebuild these reserves to comfortable levels.
- *Third*, the findings tend to confirm the notion of WPI-based PPP as a long-term anchor, namely, nominal exchange rate will tend to adjust to inflation differentials. Hence, the apparent validity of long-run PPP might warrant testing more elaborate exchange rate models that allow for a well specified role of main macroeconomic variables, including real income and money supply.

¹⁵ Empirical findings for developed countries suggest that the time period required for re-establishing PPP is shorter under floating exchange rate regimes; in this case, deviations from PPP could have a half-life as short as three to four years.

- *Finally*, if the monetary authorities wish to stabilize prices and/or reduce persistent balance of payments deficits, he must try to lower the external value of her currency.

Reference

- Ahmed, Eatzaz and Farzana Naheed Khan (2002), "Short Run Dynamics in Purchasing Power Parity: A Case of Selected Asian Countries". *The Middle East Business and Economic Review*, Vol.14, NO.2.
- Arndt, S.W., and D.J. Richardson (1987), "Real Financial Linkages Among Open Economies", Cambridge: MIT Press, London
- Ardeni, P., and Lubian, d. (1991) "Is There Tend Reversion in purchasing Power Parity". *European Economic Review*, Vol.35, pp.1035-1055.
- Bilson, J.F.O. (1978), "The Monetary Approach to Exchange Rate: Some Empirical Evidence", *IMF Staff Paper*, Vol.25, pp.48-75.
- Becketti, Sen, Caraigs, Hakkio and Douglas H. Joneis (1995), "Exchange Rate in the Long Run", Working Paper, 95-14, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City.
- Bilquees, F. (1989), "Monetary Approach to Balance of Payments: The Evidence on Reserve Flow from Pakistan", *The Pakistan Development Review*, Vol.28, No.3, PP. 195-206
- Bhatti, R. H. (1995), "International Parity Conditions: An Empirical Investigation". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis: Sheffield University Management School, U.K.
- _____ (1996), "A Correct Test of Purchasing Power Parity: The Case of Pak Rupee Exchange Rates". *The Pakistan Development Review*, Vol.35, No.4, PP.671-682.
- Balassa, B. (1964), "The Purchasing Power Parity Doctrine: A Reappraisal", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol.72, pp.584-596
- Berg, A, Borensztein, E, Milesi-Ferretti, G.M. and Pattillo, C. (2000), "Anticipating Balance of Payments Crises, the Role of the Early Warning Systems", *IMF Occasional Paper 186*. IMF, Washington, DC.
- Cassel, G. (1916), "The Present Situation of Foreign Exchange". *Economic Journal* Vol.26, pp.62-65.
- _____ (1981), "Abnormal Deviations of International Exchanges". *Economic Journal*, Vol.28, PP.413-415.

- Crowder, W.J. (1992), "Purchasing Power Parity Over the Modern Float: An Application in Higher Order Cointegration". *Economic Letters*, Vol.40, PP.313-318.
- Cooper, J.C. B. (1994), "Purchasing Power Parity: A Cointegration Analysis of Australian, Newzeland and Singaporean Currencies". *Applied Economic Letters*, Vol.1, 167-171.
- Clark, Peter, Leonardo Bartolini, Tamim Bayoumi and Steven Symansky (1994), "Exchange Rates and Economic Fundamentals: A Framework for Analysis", IMF Occasional Paper No. 115, Washington D.C
- Chishti, S., and M.A. Hasan (1993), "What Determines the Behaviour of Real Exchange Rate in Pakistan?" *The Pakistan Development Review*, Vol.32, No.4, PP.1015-1028.
- Corbae, C., and Ouliaris, S. (1988), "Cointegration and Test of Purchasing Power Parity". *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol.70, PP.508-521.
- Chinn, M.D. (1999), "Measuring Misalignment: PPP and East Asian Currencies in the 1990s", IMF Working Paper WP/99/120, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC.
- Dornbusch, R. (1976), "Expectations and Exchange Rate Dynamics". *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol.84, PP.1161-1176.
- _____ (1988), "Exchange Rate and Inflation". Cambridge: MIT press.
- Engle, C., and J. Hamilton (1990), "Long Swing in the Dollar: Are they in the Data and Do Market Know It?" *American Economic Review*, Vol.80, PP.689-713.
- Frenkel, J. (1978), "Quantifying International Mobility in 1980s" in Bernheim and Shoven (eds), *National Saving and Economic performance*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, PP.227-260.
- _____ (1981), "The Collapse of Purchasing Power Parity During 1970s". *European Economic Review*, Vol.16, PP.145-165.
- Frankel, J.A. (1993), "On Exchange Rate". Mass: MIT press.
- Frankel, J.A. (1979), "On the Mark: A Theory of Floating Exchange Rates Based on Real Interest Differentials". *American Economic Review*, Vol.69, PP.601-622.
- Genberg, H. (1978), "Purchasing Power Parity Under Fixed and Flexible Exchange Rates". *Journal of International Economics*.
- Giovannetti, G. (1989), "Testing Purchasing Power Parity as a Long Run Equilibrium

- Condition". *Giornale Degli Economisti*, Vol.46, PP.491-508.
- Hakkio, C.S. (1984), "Re-examination of Purchasing Power Parity: A Multi-country and Multi-period Study". *Journal of International Economics*, Vol.17, pp.265-277.
- _____ (1992), "Is Purchasing Parity a Useful Guide to the Dollar? ", *Economic Review* 3rd Quarter, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, PP. 37-51
- Husted, S. and MacDonald, R.R (1999), "The Asian Currency Crash: Were Badly Driven Fundamentals to Blame?", *Journal of Asian Economics*, Vol.10, pp.537-550
- Hinkle, L.E and Montiel, P.J (1999), "Exchange Rate Misalignment", Oxford University Press, World Bank, New York
- Hoontrakul, Pongsak (1999), "Exchange Rate Theory: A Review", Discussion Paper, Sasin-GIBA, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand.
- Johansen, S. (1988), " Statistical Analysis of Cointegrating Vectors", *Journal of Economic Dynamic and Control*, Vol.12, PP. 231-254
- _____ (1991) "Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegrating Vectors in Gaussian Vector autoregressive Models", *Econometrica*, Vol. 59, PP. 1551-1580.
- _____ and K. Juselius (1990), "Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference on Cointegration with Application to the Demand for Money", *Oxford Bulletin of Economic and Statistics*, Vol. 52, No. 2, PP. 169-210
- Junge, G (1984), "Purchasing Power Parity in the 1920s and the 1970s: A Note", *European Economic Review*, Vol. 26, PP. 73-82
- Kletzer, K. and R. Kohli (2000), " Exchange Rate Dynamics with Financial Repression: A Test of Exchange Rate Models for India", *Indian Council for Research and International Economic Relations*, Working Paper No. 52
- Krichene, N. (1998), " Purchasing Power Parity in Five East African Countries: Burundi, Kenya, Rowanda, Tanzania and Uganda", *IMF Working Paper* No. 148
- Kulkarni, Kishore (2001), "Determination of Chinese Yuan Rate: An Analysis of Foreign Exchange Transaction", *The Indian Economic Journal*, Vol. 48, No.3
- Kohli, Renu (2002), "Real Exchange Rate Stationarity in Manage Floats: Evidence from India", *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 2, 2002
- Kim, Yoonbia (1990), "Purchasing Power Parity in the Long-Run: A Cointegration Approach", *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Vol. 22, No. 4, PP.491-503

- Levi, M (1976), "World-Wide Effects and Import Elasticity", *Journal of International Economics*.
- _____ (1977), "Measurement Error and Bounded OLS Estimates", *Journal of Econometrics*
- Liew, Venus, Khin-Sen, Ahmed Zubaidi Baharumshah and Terence Tai-Leung Chong (2004), "Are Asian Real Exchange Rates Stationary? ", *Economic Letters*, Vol. 38, PP. 313-316
- Levich, R.M (1998), "International Financial Markets- Prices and Policies", NY: McGraw Hill
- La Cour, L and MacDonald, R. (2000), "Modeling the ECU-US dollar Exchange Rate: A Structural Monetary Interpretation", *Journal of Business Economics and Statistics*, Vol.18, No.4
- Moosa, I.A. and R.H. Bhatti (1996), "Does Purchasing Power Parity Hold Between Japan and Other Asian Countries", *Journal of International Economic Studies*, Vol. 10, PP. 85-94
- MacDonald, R. (1995) " Long-run Exchange Rate Modeling: A Survey of the Recent Evidence", *IMF Staff Paper*, Vol.43, No. 3, pp. 437-489
- _____ (2000), " Concepts to Calculate Equilibrium Exchange Rates: An Overview", Discussion Paper series 3/00, Economic Research Group of the Deutsche Bundesbank
- Nachane, D.M, and A. Chrissanthaki (1991), "Purchasing Power Parity in the Short and the Long-Run: A Reappraisal of the Post- 1973 Evidence", *Applied Economics*, Vol. 23, PP. 1257-1268
- Officer, L.H (1976), "The Purchasing Power Parity Theory of Exchange Rates: A Review Article", *IMF Staff Paper*, Vol. 23, PP. 1-60.
- _____ (1978), "The Relationship Between Absolute and Relative Purchasing Power Parity", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 60, PP. 562-568
- Officer, L.H (1984), "Purchasing Power Parity and Exchange Rate", JAI Press
- Patel, J (1990), " Purchasing Power Parity as a Long-Run Relation", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Vol. 5, PP. 367-379
- Pippenger, M.K. (1986), "Arbitrage and Efficient Markets Interpretation of Purchasing Power Parity: Theory and Evidence", *Economic Review*, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

- _____ (1993), "Cointegration Tests of Purchasing Power Parity: The Case of Swiss Exchange Rates", *Journal of International Money and Finance*, Vol. 12, PP. 46-61.
- Pesaran, M. Hashem, Yongcheol Shin and Richard J. Smith (2000), "Structural Analysis of Vector Error Correction Models with Exogenous I(1) Variables", *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 97, PP. 293-343
- Roll, R. (1979), "Violation of PPP and their Implication for Efficient Commodity Market" in Marshall Sarnat and G.P.S. Zego (eds). *International Finance and Trade*, Vol.1, (Cambridge, M.A.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1979).
- Rogoff, K. (1996), "The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 34, PP. 647-668
- Sarantis, N., and C. Stewart (1993), "Sea-Sanality, Cointegration and the Long-run Purchasing Power Parity: Evidence for Sterling Exchange Rates", *Applied Economics*, Vol.25, pp.243-250.
- Sercu, P., Raman U and C. Van Hulle (1995), "The Exchange Rate in the Presence of Transaction Costs: Implications for Tests of Finance", Vol.50, PP.1309-1319.
- Sims, C.A. (1980), "Macroeconomics and Reality", *Econometrica*, Vol. 48, No.1, PP.1-48.
- Taylor, M.P. (1988), "An Empirical Examination of Long-run Purchasing Power Parity Using Cointegration Techniques". *Applied Economics*, Vol.20, PP.1369-1381.
- Tang, Min and Ronald Q. Butiong (1994), "Purchasing Power Parity in Asian Developing Countries: A Cointegration Test", Report No.17 Asian Development Bank, Manila (Philippines), 1979.
- Yunus, M. (2000), "The Validity of Long-run Purchasing Power Parity in the South Asian Countries", *the Bangladesh Development Studies*, Vol.XXVI, No.1.
- Williamson, J.Ed (1994), "Estimating Equilibrium Exchange Rates", Institute for International Economics, Washington, DC.

Years	Exchange Rate Misalignment
1995Q1	0.469534
1995Q2	0.468865
1995Q3	0.487715
1995Q4	0.415667
1996Q1	0.429332
1996Q2	0.435237
1996Q3	0.418721
1996Q4	0.366385
1997Q1	0.413346
1997Q2	0.433556
1997Q3	0.436352
1997Q4	0.362740
1998Q1	0.397533
1998Q2	0.378228
1998Q3	0.408535
1998Q4	0.427493
1999Q1	0.447797
1999Q2	0.320063
1999Q3	0.297225
1999Q4	0.276783
2000Q1	0.273196
2000Q2	0.278745
2000Q3	0.161235
2000Q4	0.189827
2001Q1	0.123035
2001Q2	0.083160
2001Q3	0.131159
2001Q4	0.198216
2002Q1	0.214262
2002Q2	0.215723
2002Q3	0.261528
2002Q4	0.272872