香 港 樹 仁 大 學

Threshold Cointegration and Causality between CPI and PPI in Selected Countries– Some International Evidence

Woo, Kai Yin
Jia, Lin Xuan

August 2013

經濟及金融學系

Working Paper Series

Department of Economics and Finance

Hong Kong Shue Yan University

Working Paper Series
August 2013

ISBN: 978-988-16292-7-2
The URL is:
http://www.hksyu.edu/economics/working_paper/2013/Working%20paper_2013_Aug_Woo_1.pdf

Information on the Working Paper Series can be found on the last page. Please address any comments and further inquiries to:

Dr. Shu-kam Lee
Working Paper Coordinator
Department of Economics and Finance
Hong Kong Shue Yan University
10 Wai Tsui Crescent
Braemar Hill Road
North Point
Hong Kong
Fax: 2806-8044
Tel: 2806-5179 (Mr. Ken Tsui)
Email: sklee@hksyu.edu

Threshold Cointegration and Causality between CPI and PPI in Selected Countries– Some International Evidence

Woo, Kai Yin
Department of Economics and Finance
Hong Kong Shue Yan University
kywoo@hksyu.edu

Jia, Lin Xuan
Department of Economics and Finance
Hong Kong Shue Yan University

Abstract:

This paper mainly investigates the threshold cointegration with momentum threshold autoregressive (M-TAR) adjustment and Granger-causality relationships between the CPI and PPI series in the selected countries for policymakers to effectively control inflation. We apply both the linear Engle-Granger (E-G) and the nonlinear Enders-Siklos (E-S) cointegration tests for comparative analysis. Granger causality tests are adopted in the momentum threshold vector error correction model (M-TVECM), which is used to estimate the different speeds of adjustment and explore the causal relationship between CPI and PPI in the selected countries. While the E-G test cannot detect cointegration in almost all countries, the E-S test with higher power when there is asymmetric adjustment, supports the cointegration relationship in Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, Spain and Uruguay. The evidence also supports the existence of asymmetric threshold adjustment in all cointegrated systems. In addition, the empirical results indicate that Granger causality in the M-TVECM can be classified into two categories. One kind is about CPI leading to PPI, including Spain only while another kind is about bidirectional causality between CPI and PPI for other countries in the M-TVECM.

Keywords: Threshold cointegration; asymmetric adjustments, CPI, PPI

JEL: F15, C15, C32

I. Introduction:

The Consumer Price Index (CPI) simply measures the average prices for a basket of goods and services commonly purchased by households. CPI is used to determine whether general prices are higher, lower or stable over time, to calculate rate of inflation and to deflating nominal variables to real. The Producer Price Index (PPI) calculates the change in price of a basket of inputs commonly bought by producers. Similarly, the PPI can be used to deflate the gross domestic product data as well as measuring inflation.

There are two basic approaches about PPI and CPI causality relationship, which are the supply side and demand side. The production chain view for the supply side argues that it is the changes in PPI that cause CPI, because price changes in the raw materials should pass on to prices of intermediate goods as well as final goods sold to the consumer (Rogers, 1998). Hence, if there is a supply or cost-push shock on the fuel, the prices of products related to the fuel will be pushed up. Then, changes in prices of fuel should pass through to prices of intermediate products and producer prices for finished products, and lastly to the consumer goods. Therefore, shocks to producer prices should ultimately affect consumer prices and consequently PPI causes CPI. The opposite view supported by Colclough and Lange (1982) emphasize the demand side, according to which changes in the demand for final consumer goods affect the input prices-cost of production. It is because producer prices are normally set as a mark-up over costs of production such as wage costs, which is determined by demand pull and a surge in the mark-up also influence costs of resources because they depends on consumer prices. For example, the demand for agricultural raw material depends on prices of food sold to consumers. Changes in the consumer demand for food have an influence on input prices of food processing industry. Thus, shocks to consumer price should ultimately influence producer prices. Cushing and McGarvey (1990) assumed that demand for primary goods depends on expected future prices of consumer goods, implying that the expected future demand determines producer price. Consequently, changes in CPI lead to PPI. On the other hand, there is possibly no causality between CPI and PPI series when some items, like service sold to consumers comprising the CPI not included in the PPI. Therefore, the changes of the two indices are sometimes unrelated so that changes in CPI caused by the changes in prices of service have no impact on PPI.

The evidence of causality is useful for policy makers. If producer prices cause consumer prices, information on producer prices should offer valuable predictive power about consumer prices and then the authorities can identify cost-push shocks that help improve the forecasts of consumer prices inflation (Tiwari, 2012). Similarly, if consumer prices cause producer prices, information on consumer prices should offer valuable predictive power about consumer prices and then the authorities can identify demand-pull shocks that are used to help improve the forecasts of producer price inflation.

The consumer and producer price indices are interrelated. Nevertheless, the range of prices included in both indices differs significantly. Indeed, it is common for PPI baskets to include mainly domestically produced goods while CPI baskets include comprehensive sets of goods and services. In order to explore the relationship between CPI and PPI, the first thing is to know about clearly the differences between these two indices, which mainly focus on several points.

Firstly, the targeted goods and services differ in the composition from each other. Compared with CPI, although PPI includes both the goods purchased by producers as inputs, as well as the goods bought by consumers from retail sellers and the producers directly, the prices for services are excluded from PPI.

Furthermore, the effects of the taxes should not be neglected. Because the sales and taxes, which are not included in the revenue of the producer's returns, actually consist of CPI, as they are necessary expenditures for the consumers. As a result, when there is a change in the tax rate on cigarettes or alcoholic beverages, CPI can move without any change in the PPI.

Further, the differences of the two indices are intended to show different aspects of economy. Researchers can get the real growth of output of economy according to the producer price index after adjusting inflated revenue sources, whereas the consumer price index can be applied to calculate changes in the cost of living by adjusting income and expenditure streams.

As a consequence, the so-called pass through theory or supply-side approach, which implies changes in prices of crude materials should pass through to prices of intermediate goods and ultimately to consumer prices (Clark, 1995), may not be totally realized because of the existence of different components. Although some people may assume that the price change in a particular part of PPI can directly and finally be transferred into the counterpart of CPI, in reality, whether there is a pass-through of price change is hard to measure, so is the extent of validity of the pass through. The similar analysis can be applied to demand-pull approach.

Many previous papers have done empirical studies to examine the cointegration and causal relationship between CPI and PPI in many countries. The linear cointegration relationship has not been found between CPI and PPI in Australia from 1969q3 to 2010q4 by Tiwari (2012). There is no cointegration between PPI and CPI in Turkey using data from 1987:01 to 2004:08 with both Engle-Granger (1987) and Johansen (1988) tests (Akdi, et al., 2006). The CPI causes PPI in the USA (Colclough and Lange, 1982) with Sims and Granger causality tests, whereas Jones (1986) found out bidirectional causality between PPI and CPI in the US. Caporale et al. (2002) argued that unidirectional causality running from PPI to CPI in France and Denmark, causality is bidirectional in Italy, and no causality is found in Canada using Toda and Yamamoto (1995) approach from 1976:01 to 1999: 04.

The main purpose of the paper is to study the dynamic relationships between CPI and PPI series with asymmetric adjustments in several selected countries around the world so that we can provide more international evidence of the CPI-PPI relationship and causality. Given the literature that explores the threshold adjustment in the system of CPI and PPI (e.g. Esteve, et al., 2006), we adopt the momentum threshold cointegration tests of Enders and Siklos (2001) with asymmetric error-correction process for analysis. This method has been neglected in previous literature for the analysis of the CPI-PPI system. The power of this method for cointegration test is much higher than the traditional cointegration tests with symmetric adjustment if the true adjustment process is asymmetric. In addition, the momentum threshold cointegration method allows the model to display differing speeds of autoregressive decay depending upon whether the *changes* in discrepancies from equilibrium are climbing up or falling down (Enders and Siklos, 2001). This nonlinear asymmetric adjustment is helpful to smooth out the large fluctuations in the series in the paper. Therefore, the authorities might take strong measure to offset shocks to the PPI or CPI if such shocks are convinced to lead the producer or consumer inflation to deviating further from equilibrium. It may reflect the asymmetric inflation control measures by the authorities. Lastly, in order to explore the causal relationship between the CPI and the PPI in all the selected countries, the Granger-causality test is conducted in a momentum threshold vector error-correction model.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. The methodology is outlined in Section 2, the data description is done in Section 3, the empirical results are reported in Section 4, and then the main conclusions are summarized in Section 5.

Ⅱ. Methodology:

In order to investigate the cointegration between CPI and PPI series in these selected countries, we will adopt the Dickey Fuller generalized least squares (GLS) test (Elliott, et al., 1996) to test for the stationarity of the CPI and PPI series, which utilizes the null hypothesis of having a unit root against the alternative of stationary series. The lag lengths in the fitted regressions depend on the Schwarz criterion (SC). If all series are integrated of order 1, denoted by **I**(1), we proceed to cointegration tests.

Next, the traditional Engle-Granger (1987) cointegration methodology is used to test for the long run equilibrium relationship for the series of CPI and PPI, with the null hypothesis that there is no cointegration against the alternative of cointegration with symmetric adjustment. We will first adopt ordinary least squares (OLS) to estimate the long-run equilibrium relationship as:

$$\mathrm{y_t} = \mathrm{a} + \mathrm{bx_t} + \mu_\mathrm{t}, \qquad (1)$$

where a and b are the estimated parameters, $\mathrm{y_t}$ and $\mathrm{x_t}$ are the price indices under study, and μ_t is the disturbance term that may be serially correlated.

Then, Dickey-Fuller regression is constructed for μ_t and we focus on the OLS estimate of ρ in the regression equation:

$$\hat{\mu}_t = \rho\hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k}\delta_\mathrm{i}\Delta\hat{\mu}_{t-i} + \nu_t, \qquad (2)$$

where δ_i is the regression coefficients of lagged differenced terms and ν_t is a white-noise disturbance. If the regression residual μ_t is stationary and then it is significant to reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration by using the t and z statistics on ρ (Engle and Granger, 1987), there is a long run equilibrium between CPI and PPI series, implying that they are cointegrated with symmetric adjustment.

However, the point is that the traditional cointegration tests overlook the situation of asymmetric adjustment. For example, the Engle-Granger (E-G) tests only take account for symmetric cointegration, which is neither complete nor accurate. As we mentioned previously, there are evidence of asymmetric adjustments between CPI and PPI series in literature. Therefore, I need to further test for the long-term equilibrium with the existence of asymmetric adjustment. The so called threshold autoregressive (TAR) model (Tong, 1983) is provided to allow the degree of autoregressive decay depending upon the state of the threshold variable. Enders and Siklos (2001) made a specification of asymmetric threshold autoregressive model to address this problem. The TAR model for μ_t is:

$$\Delta \hat{\mu}_t = \rho_1 I_t \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \rho_2 (1 - I_t) \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \nu_t \tag{3}$$

$$\text{where} \quad I_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu_{t-1} \geq \tau \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu_{t-1} < \tau \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

I_t is called the Heaviside indicator, ρ_1 and ρ_2 represent the speed of adjustment coefficients in two regimes, τ is the value of threshold, and ν_t is independent of μ_j (j<t). The consistently estimated value of τ can be searched from the fitted model (3) such that the sum of squared errors of the fitted model. Adjustment is

symmetric if $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ so that the Engle-Granger test is just a special case of TAR model. From (4), TAR model allows μ_t to display differing amounts of autoregressive decay depending on whether its previous value μ_{t-1} is greater or smaller than the threshold value.

However, the Equation (3) may not be sufficient to capture the dynamic adjustment of μ_t toward long run equilibrium value. Enders and Siklos (2001) shows that the different amounts of autoregressive decay can depend on whether the previous *change* in μ_{t-1} is climbing up or falling down, and then suggests the momentum threshold autoregressive (M-TAR) model:

$$\Delta \hat{\mu}_t = \rho_1 M_t \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \rho_2 (1 - M_t) \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_i \Delta \hat{\mu}_{t-i} + \nu_t , \tag{5}$$

$$\text{where} \quad M_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Delta\mu_{t-1} \geq \tau \\ 0 & \text{if } \Delta\mu_{t-1} < \tau \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

M_t is also represented as the Heaviside indicator. M-TAR adjustment can be especially useful when policy makers are considered as attempting to mitigate any large *changes* in series under study. The main purpose of my paper is to study the dynamic relationship between CPI and PPI series, for the inflation rate is calculated as the change in the natural log of price indices. The government authorities might tend to take measures to offset shocks to the CPI-PPI relationship if such shocks are considered to induce increase in inflationary pressures caused by the widening of the discrepancies in the CPI-PPI relationship. The M-TAR model constructed using (6) shows different speeds of decay depending upon increasing or decreasing discrepancies from equilibrium in a previous period $\Delta\mu_{t\text{-}1}$, is then more appropriate than the TAR model constructed using (4) in my paper. Hence, we apply the M-TAR model only in the following part of paper.

As suggested by Enders and Siklos (2001), there are two sequential steps of testing for threshold cointegration: the one is to test for the linear cointegration and the other one is to test for the nonlinear adjustment process. The first step is the linear cointegration test which is to test the null hypothesis of $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0$ using the F statistics. Because of the fact that F statistic is non-standard under the null, the corresponding critical values are obtained from simulation and are found in Table 5 of Enders and Siklos (2001). The F statistic is denoted by Φ(M). If the Φ(M) statistic cannot reject the null of non-cointegration, we stop and exclude the series under study out of the subsequent analysis. If the Φ(M) statistic rejects the null of non-cointegration, we implement the second step of testing for the null hypothesis of whether there is symmetric adjustment, that is $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ with the standard F-statistic. That is to say, the standard F statistic is used to test the null hypothesis of symmetric adjustment behavior against the alternative one about the existence of asymmetric adjustment depending on whether $\Delta\mu_t \geq \text{or} < \tau$. If it can significantly reject the null hypothesis of $\rho_1 = \rho_2$, the existence of asymmetric adjustment can be supported.

After that, the causal relationship of CPI and PPI series should be explored for cointegrated systems. Unlike the conventional Granger causality test, which is applied to check the linear causal relationship between series in vector autoregressive (VAR) model, we combine both the vector error correction model (VECM) and the M-TAR model into so-called the momentum threshold vector error correction model (M-TVECM), which is used to conduct the Granger causality test, especially for the nonlinear causal relationship. The M-TVECM is specified as follows

$$\Delta CPI_t = \alpha_0 + M_t \rho_{1c} \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + (1 - M_t)\rho_{2c} \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{L} \alpha_{1j} \Delta CPI_{t-j} + \sum_{j=1}^{L} \alpha_{2j} \Delta PPI_{t-j} + \varepsilon_{1t} \tag{7}$$

$$\Delta PPI_t = \beta_0 + M_t \rho_{1p} \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + (1 - M_t)\rho_{2p} \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{L} \beta_{1j} \Delta CPPI_{t-j} + \sum_{j=1}^{L} \beta_{2j} \Delta PPI_{t-j} + \varepsilon_{2t} \tag{8}$$

where α_0 and β_0 are intercepts, ρ_{1c}, ρ_{2c}, ρ_{1p} and ρ_{2p}, are the estimated asymmetric adjustment coefficients. The optimal lag order is L chosen based on the model criterion, and ε_{1t} and ε_{2t} are the error terms that are assumed to be white-noise disturbances.

The Granger causality is used to test the direction of causal relationship from PPI to CPI in (7) under the null hypothesis of $\rho_{1c} = \rho_{2c} = \alpha_{2j} = 0$ for all j with the standard Wald statistic. The inclusion of $\rho_{1c} = \rho_{2c} = 0$ in the Granger causality test is due to the inclusion of PPI series in the previous period's disequilibrium μ_{t-1} (Koop, 2005). If the statistic can significantly reject the null hypothesis that PPI does not Granger-cause CPI, then PPI can Granger cause CPI. To the opposite, the direction from CPI to PPI can be tested in the Granger causality test in (8) under the null hypothesis of $\rho_{1p} = \rho_{2p} = \beta_{1j} = 0$, for all j. Likewise, the inclusion of $\rho_{1p} = \rho_{2p} =$ 0 in the Granger causality test is because of the inclusion of CPI series in the previous period's disequilibrium μ_{t-1}. If the standard Wald statistic can significantly reject the null hypothesis that CPI does not Granger-cause PPI, then the result that CPI can Granger cause PPI can be concluded.

Ⅲ.Data

All the monthly data of both CPI and PPI series are obtained from the IMF International Financial Statistics. The 10 selected countries include Australia, Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Uruguay and US. The sample periods run from 1980:01 to 2012:03, except the fact that the data for Japan are collected from 1974:01 to 2012:03, for Pakistan and Spain from 1981:01 to 2012:03, and for Denmark and Uruguay from 1985:01-2012:03. All price indices are taken in natural logarithm and seasonally adjusted using X12 method.

Ⅳ. Empirical results:

Unit root test:

Before conducting the cointegration tests, we apply the Dickey-Fuller generalized least squares (DF-GLS) test to examine the null hypothesis of having a unit root against the alternative of stationarity for both CPI and PPI series in all sampled countries. As seen from the results in Table 1, the DF-GLS tests cannot reject the null of a unit root for all series in level. However, they can significantly reject the null when all the series are in the first difference. As a result, we conclude that the series are all **I**(1), which is the premise of cointegration.

Table1: DF-GLS unit root tests

Country	CPI				PPI			
	level	Lag	First difference	lag	Level	Lag	First difference	Lag
Australia	-0.642	7	-3.995***	6	-1.248	2	-10.433***	1
Canada	-0.320	5	-4.354***	4	-0.447	1	-12.647***	0
Denmark	-0.396	0	-15.411***	0	-1.323	2	-5.156***	3
Indonesia	-2.430	4	-4.255***	3	-1.451	0	-15.775***	0
Japan	-0.808	12	-4.016***	11	-0.591	1	-4.632***	0
Norway	-0.551	8	-13.013***	0	-0.609	0	-18.623***	0
Spain	-0.814	9	-3.380**	8	-0.723	3	-5.135***	2
Pakistan	-0.760	3	-3.982***	4	-1.193	2	-9.452***	1
Uruguay	-0.842	12	-3.408**	11	-0.492	12	-3.934***	11
USA	-0.390	3	-4.170***	3	-1.773	1	-4.980***	2

Notes:
A constant and a linear trend are included in the fitted regression.
The choice of lags is based on Schwarz Criterion (SC).
The critical values are -3.4783, -2.8926 and -2.5760 at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.
Asterisk (***), (**) and (*) denotes the statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.

Engle-Granger (E-G) cointegration test

After the unit root tests, we implement the E-G cointegration tests. The estimated coefficients (b) of Equation (1) and the cointegration test results are presented in

Table 2. The E-G t statistics and z statistics are insignificant and cannot reject the null hypothesis of no long-run cointegration relationship even at the 10% level for all cases except the cases of Indonesia and Pakistan where the null hypothesis can be rejected at the 10% and 1% significance level, respectively. As for Denmark, t statistic can reject the null but z statistic cannot. Generally, the evidence of the E-G cointegration tests is not in favor of cointegration with symmetric adjustment process.

Table 2: Enders-Granger (E-G) cointegration test

Country	β_1	t-stat	p-value	z-stat	p-value	lag	SC
Australia	1.755	-1.011	0.8997	-2.722	0.8943	2	-6.061
Canada	1.282	-2.122	0.4650	-8.984	0.4241	2	-7.132
Denmark	1.202	-3.827	0.0137**	-15.314	0.1360	2	-7.397
Indonesia	0.889	-3.100	0.0907*	-19.101	0.0640*	0	-4.779
Japan	0.805	-2.452	0.3020	-3.338	0.8560	3	-8.355
Norway	0.746	-1.102	0.8814	-1.821	0.9390	0	-5.755
Pakistan	0.913	-4.223	0.0038***	-35.855	0.0015***	1	-7.008
Spain	1.430	-0.789	0.9337	-2.580	0.9023	3	-7.668
Uruguay	1.057	-1.085	0.8851	-3.495	0.8451	12	-3.956
USA	1.294	-1.983	0.5373	-6.672	0.5955	1	-6.300

Notes:
CPI is the dependent variable in the equation.
The lag length is chosen based on Schwarz Criterion (SC).
P-values are based on the MacKinnon (1996).
Asterisk (***), (**) and (*) denotes the statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.

Enders-Siklos (2001) momentum threshold cointegration tests

The above E-G tests do not find any cointegration relationship between CPI and PPI series for almost all countries, for the E-G tests that overlook the existence of asymmetric adjustments may lead to misspecification. To allow for the possibility of nonlinearity in the adjustment process, we apply the Φ(M) statistics to re-examine the cointegration relationship between CPI and PPI series in M-TAR models, and the empirical results are then reported in Table 3.

The Φ(M) statistics can reject the null hypothesis of non-cointegration ($\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0$) for 7 countries, which are Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Japan, Spain, Pakistan and Uruguay, indicating that there is long-run equilibrium in these countries. The cointegrating parameters (b) of these countries can be found in Table 2 and the parameters are found to be deviating from unity. For example, the value of b for Spain is 1.43. The null of non-cointegration for other 3 countries - Australia, Norway and USA - cannot be rejected and then these 3 countries will be dropped out in my following analysis. After that, we implement the second step of the E-S test, examining the null of linearity $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ for the cointegrated cases using the standard F statistics. The empirical evidence demonstrates the existence of threshold cointegration with asymmetric adjustment $\rho_1 \neq \rho_2$ in the M-TAR models of these 7 countries. The estimated threshold variables are shown in Table 2.

Taking Canada as an example, we find that the estimated Φ(M) statistic of cointegration test (5.978) is significant at the 10% level, and the estimated F-statistic of nonlinearity test (7.378) is significant at the 1% level. As a result, it is significant to reject the null hypotheses of both the non-cointegration of $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0$ and the symmetric adjustment of $\rho_1 = \rho_2$, implying there is threshold cointegration with asymmetric adjustment in Canada.

Compared with E-G test, the Enders-Siklos (2001) M-TAR cointegration tests have higher power to detect the cointegration relationships for it allows for asymmetric error-correcting adjustments. We now proceed to estimating the M-TVECM in order to exploit the asymmetric adjustment process in the bivariate system.

Table 3: Enders-Siklos M-TAR cointegration tests

Country	Φ(M): $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0$	lag	F-test: $\rho_1 = \rho_2$	ρ_1	ρ_2	τ
Australia	2.006	2	___	___	___	___
Canada	5.978*	2	7.378***	0.0044	-0.0350	-0.0003
Denmark	10.201***	3	7.537***	-0.0357	-0.0024	0.0013
Indonesia	8.032**	2	6.941***	-0.1805	-0.0355	0.0142
Japan	9.523***	1	6.721***	0.0009	-0.0058	0.0033
Norway	3.043	1	___	___	___	___
Spain	8.983***	2	16.796***	-0.0539	0.0016	0.0057
Pakistan	16.386***	2	8.391***	0.0005	-0.2012	0.0046
Uruguay	6.890**	8	13.415***	0.0005	-0.2012	-0.0236
USA	2.000	8	___	___	___	___

Notes:
Critical values of the Φ(M) tests are based on table 5 of Enders and Siklos (2001).
Critical values of the standard F statistic are 6.635, 3.8415 and 2.70554, at 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.
Asterisk (***), (**) and (*) denotes the statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.

Estimation of the momentum threshold vector error correction model (M-TVECM)

The estimation of the M-TVECM in the form of (7) and (8) is done by the OLS method. The adjustment coefficients, $\rho_{1c}, \rho_{2c}, \rho_{1p}$ and ρ_{2p}, of the error-correction terms in the M-TVECM are presented in Table 4. The results show the asymmetry of the adjustment processes in the M-TVECM. We find that all the significant coefficients are of correct sign. For Canada, Denmark, Spain, and Uruguay, only one adjustment coefficient in either equation of CPI or PPI is significant. In Canada, the adjustment coefficient in the equation of PPI is significant only when $\Delta\mu_{t-1} < -0.003$. In Denmark, the adjustment coefficient in the equation of CPI is significant only when $\Delta\mu_{t-1} > 0.0013$. In Spain, the adjustment coefficient in the equation of PPI is significant only when $\Delta\mu_{t-1} \geq 0.0057$. In Uruguay, the adjustment coefficient in the equation of CPI is significant only when $\Delta\mu_{t-1} < -0.0236$. Moreover, for Indonesia, all adjustment coefficients in the equation of PPI can be significant and it is found that the increasing discrepancies from long-term equilibrium (such that $\Delta\mu_{t-1} \geq 0.0142$), are eliminated much quicker than the decreasing discrepancies (such that $\Delta\mu_{t-1} < 0.0142$). For Japan, all adjustment coefficients in the equation of CPI can be significant and it is found that the increasing discrepancies from long-term equilibrium (such that $\Delta\mu_{t-1} \geq 0.0033$), are eliminated slightly faster than the decreasing discrepancies. Also, for Pakistan, all adjustment coefficients in the equation of PPI can be significant and it is found that the increasing discrepancies from long-term equilibrium (such that $\Delta\mu_{t-1} \geq 0.0046$), are eliminated much quicker than the decreasing discrepancies. Also, only the adjustment coefficient in the equation of CPI in the regime of increasing discrepancies from equilibrium can be significant. In general, discrepancies from equilibrium resulting from increases in consumer prices would be eliminated quicker than increase in producer prices. It may reflect the stronger measures to control consumer price inflation than producer price inflation.

Besides the asymmetry, it is found that the price indices can adjust in response to disequilibrium when at least one corresponding adjustment coefficient is significant (Granger, 1988). The complete picture of Granger causality between the price indices can be shown using the Granger causality tests in the M-TVECM.

Table 4: Estimation of M-TVECM

Country	Dependent Variable	Adjustment coefficients		Q1	Q2
		ρ_{1c}, ρ_{1p}	ρ_{2c}, ρ_{2p}		
Canada	CPI	-0.0033 （0.0046）	-0.0063 （0.0045）	0.341 [0.987]	1.572 [0.992]
	PPI	-0.0045 （0.0088）	0.0219** （0.0087）		

Denmark	CPI	-0.0640** (0.0284)	0.0115 (0.0269)	0.296 [0.990]	0.551 [0.999]
	PPI	-0.0924 (0.0620)	0.0398 (0.0586)		
Indonesia	CPI	0.0246 （0.0227）	-0.0100 （0.0070）	0.123 [0.998]	0.641 [1.000]
	PPI	0.1817*** （0.0688）	0.0131 （0.0210）		
Japan	CPI	-0.0139*** （0.0023）	-0.0101*** （0.0014）	1.532 [0.821]	3.449 [0.903]
	PPI	-0.0031 （0.0031）	-0.0024 （0.0016）		
Spain	CPI	-0.0047 (0.0068)	-0.0009 (0.0024)	1.022 [0.906]	1.806 [0.986]
	PPI	0.0313*** (0.0090)	0.0003 （0.0031）		
Pakistan	CPI	-0.0534** （0.02690）	-0.0238 （0.0171）	0.107 [0.998]	0.612 [1.000]
	PPI	0.1223*** （0.0433）	0.0523* （0.0275）		
Uruguay	CPI	0.0096 （0.0097）	-0.1952*** （0.0382）	2.201 [0.699]	9.415 [0.309]
	PPI	0.0059 （0.0106）	0.0640 （0.0397）		

Notes:
Q1 and Q2 represent the autocorrelation Q-statistics of lag1 and lag2, respectively.
Standard error is showed in parentheses
The p-value are presented in the squared brackets
Asterisk (***), (**) and (*) denotes the statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.

Granger causality test in M-TVECM

What we can see from the results presented in Table 5, the null hypothesis of no Granger causality from PPI to CPI can be rejected, but the null hypothesis of no Granger causality from CPI to PPI cannot be rejected in Spain, implying that there is a unidirectional causality from CPI to PPI. Consequently, the empirical evidence can demonstrate the demand side approach and it can help policy makers in these countries to predict future producer inflation rate.

Therefore, the current inflation in Spain should be demand-led, and "systematic" loose monetary conditions are the important reasons to promote flourishing demand. Therefore, inflation control should start with excess liquidity, and then guide the money supply into the production area.

The second case is that both the null hypothesis of no Granger causality from PPI to CPI and the null hypothesis of no Granger causality from CPI to PPI can be rejected in the rest of countries - Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan and Uruguay, implying the bidirectional causality between CPI and PPI. Consequently, the empirical evidence can support both the supply and demand side approaches, thus policy makers can use both the CPI and PPI to make future inflation rate prediction.

Consequently, the inflation is caused by both the supply and demand sides, so policymakers should control inflation by focusing on both sides. Apart from controlling the excess liquidity, input prices should also be under control. The retail sector uses current domestic or imported materials as input, but adds value with a lag. Further, the input prices depend not only on domestic demand and supply, but also on their imports. The latter depends on the prices of the imported goods, the nominal exchange rate, the level of indirect taxes, the marginal cost of retail production, and interest rates. Therefore, it is important to make good control of all of these factors.

Table 5：Granger causality test

Country	Null Hypothesis	Wald Statistics	p-value	Direction of causality
Canada	PPI does not Granger cause CPI	13.955**	0.0301	CPI↔PPI
	CPI does not Granger cause PPI	13.135**	0.0409	
Denmark	PPI does not Granger cause CPI	17.832***	0.0013	CPI↔PPI
	CPI does not Granger cause PPI	15.453***	0.0038	
Indonesia	PPI does not Granger cause CPI	73.479***	0.0000	CPI↔PPI
	CPI does not Granger cause PPI	20.844***	0.0020	
Japan	PPI does not Granger cause CPI	82.359***	0.0000	CPI↔PPI
	CPI does not Granger cause PPI	18.885***	0.0044	
Pakistan	PPI does not Granger cause CPI	14.487**	0.0246	CPI↔PPI
	CPI does not Granger cause PPI	14.337**	0.0261	
Spain	PPI does not Granger cause CPI	9.045	0.1710	CPI→PPI
	CPI does not Granger cause PPI	29.550***	0.0000	
Uruguay	PPI does not Granger cause CPI	672.552***	0.0073	CPI↔PPI
	CPI does not Granger cause PPI	155.519***	0.0000	

Notes:

Asterisk (***), (**) and (*) denotes the statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.

Ⅴ. Conclusion:

This paper explored the cointegration relationship between CPI and PPI in selected countries all around the world, such as Australia, Indonesia, Uruguay and so on, and both Engel Granger (1987) test and Enders-Siklos (2001) asymmetric cointegration test in M-TAR model have been applied. In addition, this paper also tested for Granger causality in M-TVECM between CPI and PPI in all the selected countries.

The results suggest that the power of E-S is higher than E-G., because the cointegration relationship in Indonesia, Japan, Sweden, Spanish, Pakistan and Uruguay has not been demonstrated with E-G test, but supported by the E-S test, for the latter E-S test take asymmetric cointegration into the consideration.

Apart from these, the empirical data obtained from the Granger causality between CPI and PPI in the selected countries can be classified into tow categories: one kind is about PPI leading to CPI, including Spain; another kind is bidirectional causality, including Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan and Uruguay. And the corresponding policies have been suggested in the paper.

Analyzing the directions of the causal relationship between the CPI and the PPI is the important goal of my studies. Not only because it allows policy makers to predict future inflation, but also it helps policy makers to be well prepared to avoid, or at least mitigate, the negative consequences of inflation. This finding can help policy makers to rely more on the link between CPI and PPI and use changes in CPI to predict changes in PPI.

Reference:

Akcay, S. 2011, 'The causal relationship between producer price index and consumer price index: empirical evidence from selected European countries', International Journal of Economics and Finance, vol. 3, No.6, pp. 227-231

Caporale, G.M. Katsimi & Pittis, N., 2002, "Causality links between consumer and producer prices: Some empirical evidences," Southern Economic Journal, 68, 703-711.

Clark, T., 1995, "Do producer prices lead consumer prices?," Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Economic Review, Third Quarter, pp.25-39.

Colclough, W. G and M. D. Lange, 1982, "Empirical evidence of causality from consumer to wholesale prices," Journal of Econometrics, 19, 379-384.

Cushing, M.J and M.G, McGarvey, (1990), "Feedback between wholesale and consumer price inflation: A re-examination of the evidence," Southern Economic Journal, 56, 1059-1072.

Dorestani, A. and Arjomand L.H., 2006, "An empirical study of the relationship between consumer and producer price index: a unit root test and test of cointegration, The Coastal Business Journal ,Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 33-38

Elliott, G., T. J. Rothenberg, and J. H. Stock. 1996. Efficient tests for an autoregressive unit root. Econometric 64: 813–836.

Enders, W. & Siklos, P.J. 2001, "Cointegration and Threshold Adjustment', Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, vol,19, No.2, pp.168-177

Engle, R. F., and Granger, C. W. J. ，1987, "Cointegration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing," Econometric, 55, 251-276

Esteve, V., Pareja, S.G., Serrano, J.A.M., and Vivero, R.L.，2006， "Threshold cointegration and nonlinear adjustment between goods and services inflation in the United States" viewed 8 October 2012, http:// www.sciencedirect.com

Ghazali, M. F. 2008, "Do Producer Prices Cause Consumer Prices? -Some Empirical Evidence" International Journal of Business and Management, Vol.3, No.11, pp.78-82

Granger, C. W., 1988, "Some recent development in a concept of causality", Journal of Econometrics, 39, 199-211

Heimonen, K. 2006, Nonlinear adjustment in PPP-evidence from threshold cointegration, viewed 10 October 2012, <http://link.springer.com /article / 10. 1007%2Fs00181-005-0026-5?LI=true#>

He, L.P., Fan,G.,& Hu,J.N. (2008),. CPI VS PPI: Which Drives Which? Economic Research Journal, Vol. 43, No.11, pp.16-27.

Johansen, S., 1988. Statistical Analysis of Cointegration Vectors, Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 12, pp.231-254

Jones, J. D. (1986). Consumer prices, wholesale prices, and causality, Empirical Economics, 11, pp. 41-55

Koop, G., 2005. Analysis of Economic data, 2nd edition. Chichester, England ; Hoboken, NJ : John Wiley & Sons, c2005.

Liu, F.L. & Lu,X.. 2011, "CPI and PPI's "False Transmission" and the Revision-A Relatively Robust Empirical Framework", viewed on 15 December 2012, < http://wenku.baidu.com/view/3cc24d4fe518964bcf847c27.html >

Maki, D. 2005, "Asymmetric adjustment of the equilibrium relationship between the nominal interest rate and inflation rate." Economics Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 9 pp. 1−8

Rogers, R. M. 1998. "A Primer on Short-Term Linkages Key Economic Data Series." Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta Economic Review, Second Quarter, pp.40-54.

Sheu, H.J. & Liao, C.H. 2011, ‘Dynamics of stock market integration between the US and the BRIC’, African Journal of Business Management, vol.5, no (9), pp.3647-3689

Shu, C.C., 2008, Asymmetric cointegration relationship among Asian exchange rates, springer Science Business Media, viewed 12 October 2011, < http://hdl.handle.net/10.1007/s10644-008-9044-6 >

Sidaoui,J., Capistrán, C., Chiquiar, D., and Francia1, M. R. On the predictive content of the PPI on CPI inflation: the case of Mexico, viewed on 15 November 2012, < http://www.bis.org/publ/bppdf/bispap49o.pdf >

Tiwari, A. K.,. 2012. An Empirical Investigation of Causality between Producers' Price and Consumers' Price Indices in Australia in Frequency Domain. Economic Modeling, Vol. 29, No. 5: pp. 1571–1578.om consumer

Toda, H.Y., Yamamoto, T. 1995. Statistical inference in vector auto-regressions with possibly integrated processes, Journal of Econometrics 66, pp.225–250,

Tong, H., 1983."Threshold models in non-linear time series analysis" *Springer-Verlag Inc*. Berlin; New York.

The working paper series is a series of occasional papers funded by the Research and Staff Development Committee. The objective of the series is to arouse intellectual curiosity and encourage research activities. The expected readership will include colleagues within Hong Kong Shue Yan University, as well as academics and professionals in Hong Kong and beyond.

Department of Economics and Finance

Hong Kong Shue Yan University