Assessing the Dynamics of the Inflation Convergence Process in the New EU Members from Central and Eastern Europe on their Path from Transition to EMU Accession: Is There a Case for Nonlinear Convergence?

Alina Spiru

Lancaster University Management School

Abstract

This study assesses the extent of convergence of inflation rates of a sample of new EU members from Central and Eastern European to several measures of Eurozone norm inflation. We conduct univariate and panel unit root tests in a linear framework and also examine the potential for nonlinear convergence. Our results reveal that the inflation convergence performance of CEE countries is conditional on the inflation benchmark, the composition of the panel and the correlations among panel members. The battery of linearity tests we carry out suggest that inflation convergence in a nonlinear fashion is ubiquitous for the period that includes the accession of the CEE former transition economies to the EU.

Key words: inflation convergence, panel unit root tests, linearity tests, EU accession

JEL classification: F15, C33, O57

1. Introduction

After becoming members of the European Union, the main goal for Central and Eastern European (henceforth, CEE) countries was to prepare for joining the monetary union as soon as possible, given their status as members without an "opt out" clause. Their EMU membership was, however, conditional on the fulfilment of the Maastricht criteria for nominal convergence, which impose a number of benchmark values for inflation, interest rates, government deficit and public debt and also entail exchange rate stability. This set of tight criteria has been designed to ensure that the participation of new member states in the Euro area contributes to the stability and viability of the system.

In this paper, we perform an empirical inquiry into an important issue pertaining to the monetary integration of the CEE economies, by investigating one of the facets of nominal convergence, specifically the convergence of inflation rates. Compliance with this convergence criterion is intrinsically related to the effectiveness of monetary policy in achieving disinflation. A positive result in the attempt to bring the high levels of inflation recorded at the beginning of the economic transition process witnessed by these countries down to close to the average of the Eurozone economies is suggestive of monetary policy efficiency and also encourages inflation convergence.

Eleven countries form the sample under scrutiny in this paper. In terms of macroeconomic policy design, they have been characterised by a variety of experiences: ten of them joined the EU in May 2004, eight after successfully completing the transformation of their economies (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia), two others (Cyprus and Malta) after years of experience as market economies. The eleventh country of the sample is Romania, which joined the EU in January 2007. The composition of the sample portends a challenging assessment that combines elements of comparative analysis and country-specific coverage.

The prospects of these economies as candidates for monetary integration depended strongly on the ability to align themselves with the institutions and macroeconomic policies of the existing EMU members. Although structural change and institutional adaptation to EMU norms is still in progress in some of the economies included in this study, convergence to EMU standards has gained momentum. Therefore, the analysis conducted here represents a stock-taking empirical exercise, whose purpose is twofold. First, it examines the extent to which the candidate countries have been able to achieve a certain degree of convergence to EMU standards. Second, it sheds light on convergence to group averages, relevant to assessing a number of common features.

The Maastricht Treaty states an explicit target in terms of convergence of inflation rates: the inflation rate of a country that aims to join the EMU should not exceed the average of the three lowest inflation rates in the Eurozone by more than 1.5%. Since the beginning of the 1980s until the introduction of the Euro in 2002, inflation rates have declined within the Euro area. After the inception of the single currency, however, a proliferating inflation divergence has been observable. The pertinent literature is yet to discern whether this divergence is only short natured or represents the manifestation of a more structural phenomenon. A forthcoming EMU enlargement, mostly with CEE countries, was likely to add new dimensions to this stylized fact. Two questions become relevant in this context. First, what is the degree of inflation convergence towards EMU benchmarks which characterises the future members of the monetary union? Second, what is the anticipated effect of the EMU enlargement on the inflation rates of the current members? The empirical analysis conducted in this paper endeavours to provide an answer to the first question, while highlighting some issues that may be relevant in tackling the second. To this end, the methodological framework employed here builds on the literature on growth convergence and brings together several econometric techniques to address the stationarity properties of inflation differentials. The main contribution of the analysis performed in this paper consists in employing an augmented framework, which features two classes of econometric techniques: time series and panel, while encompassing two modeling paradigms: linear and nonlinear. The use of the nonlinear approach in this context is novel and provides results that generate new insights into the inflation convergence process. Moreover, this study covers the period January 1993 to December 2004, which extends the time span used in other empirical analyses in this vein, in an attempt to draw more reliable inferences. In terms of country coverage, we include more countries and form more panels, in order to gain a better understanding of the impact of institutional and regional characteristics on convergence, while also paying attention to country-specific factors and cross-country differences.

The organisation of paper is as follows. After this introduction, a selective review of studies on inflation convergence is presented in section 2. The third section of the paper focuses on the methodology employed. Section 4 presents the data and reports the empirical findings of the analysis, using conventional and more sophisticated approaches to the testing of order of integration. Section 5 discusses the results from a policy perspective. Section 6 concludes.

2. A Selective Review of Empirical Studies on Inflation Convergence

The primary interest in this section is in reviewing the techniques employed to examine inflation convergence. From a methodological point of view, one can classify existing attempts into two broad categories: time series approaches and panel studies. While the first approach has dominated most of the early contributions, the second has started to gain popularity when the enhanced power of panel methods over their univariate time series counterparts was widely documented.

The time series-based strand of the literature examines inflation convergence between European economies by employing several techniques. In one of the first attempts to study the degree of convergence in inflation rates of the EMS members, Koedijk and Kool (1992) utilise a variant of the principal components method and test convergence by investigating the stationarity of the first largest principal component of inflation deviations from the German inflation, which is considered as benchmark. Hall et al. (1992) and Holmes (1998) examine inflation convergence by estimating models with time-varying coefficients, using a Kalman filter technique. Other studies (Caporale and Pittis, 1993; Thom, 1995; Siklos and Wohar, 1997; Holmes, 1998; Westbrook, 1998; Amián and Zumaquero, 2002; Mentz and Sebastian, 2003) employ cointegration analysis to identify common stochastic trends in the data on inflation rates. In these papers, the existence of a common stochastic trend is regarded as evidence of convergence. The smaller the number of common stochastic trends and, therefore the greater the number of cointegrating relations, the stronger the empirical support for convergence between inflation rates. To examine convergence of inflation rates among EMU countries, Busetti et al. (2006) use a sequence of univariate and multivariate unit root and stationarity tests that take into account correlations across countries.

A second strand of the literature advocates the use of panel unit root and cointegration tests to gauge the degree of inflation convergence. Kočenda and Papell (1997) employ quarterly CPI-based inflation rates for the period 1952 to 1994 to perform panel unit root tests on inflation convergence within the countries of the European Union. They report evidence in favour of inflation convergence, mainly among countries participating from the start in the ERM and argue that the convergence process was not substantially affected by the 1992 and 1993 ERM crises. On the other hand, Holmes (2002), using monthly, CPI-based inflation data over the interval 1972 to 1999 finds that inflation convergence was strongest during the period 1983 to 1990, whereas the turbulence experienced within the ERM in the early 1990s conferred some degree of macroeconomic independence to certain member countries.

Beck and Weber (2005) examine the mean-reverting behaviour of regional inflation rates for a number of EU countries over the interval 1981 to 2001. They examine both sigma- and beta-convergence and find that inflation dispersion among EU regions is higher than in the US or Japan. To test for mean-reverting behaviour (equivalent to beta-convergence), Beck and Weber (op.cit.) complement a univariate approach, based on the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test, with the panel unit root test developed by Levin and Lin (1992, 1993).

The main conclusion that can be drawn by examining the evidence on inflation convergence among the EU (or EMU) economies is that the results are sensitive to the time interval under scrutiny and certain institutional arrangements. It is widely agreed that participation in the ERM has fostered inflation convergence, while the introduction of a single currency and a common monetary policy generated a certain degree of divergence among inflation rates.

The prospect of the eastward enlargement of the EU has generated a growing interest in the issue of macroeconomic convergence of CEE economies, especially after 1995, when these countries started to formally apply for membership. The degree of nominal convergence of the CEE countries has been assessed from two angles: first, within their own groups, formed based on geographical and/or institutional criteria (Kočenda, 2001; Kutan and Yigit, 2002) and second, with respect to EU benchmarks (Brada and Kutan, 2002; Brada et al., 2002; Kutan and Yigit, 2002 and 2004; Kočenda et al., 2006). From a methodological standpoint, some of the above mentioned studies employ time series testing techniques, while others attempt to mediate the short time series dimension of the sample by applying panel methods. Moreover, nominal convergence is examined together with real convergence. Brada et al. (2002) argue that convergence is an evolving rather than a stable concept. To emphasise the time-varying character of convergence, they employ rolling cointegration techniques developed by Hansen and Johansen (1999) and Rangvid and Sorensen (2002).

The findings of the studies that examine real and nominal convergence of CEE countries to EU or EMU benchmarks reveal that these countries have surpassed the difficulties of the macrostabilisation process and started moving in the same direction as the EU economies. However, the results are sensitive to the methodology employed. Moreover, several studies (Égert et al., 2004; Bulíř and Hurnik, 2006; Pirovano and Van Poeck, 2011) shed light on the lessons the CEE economies can learn from the experience of the older Eurozone members and on the suitability of the Maastricht inflation criterion for the new EU member states.

3. Methodology

The concept of convergence is inherently related to that of economic growth. Therefore, definitions and methodological approaches to convergence are rooted in the empirical growth literature, pioneered by Baumol (1986), Barro (1991) and Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1991, 1992). This literature defines two types of convergence: absolute and conditional. Absolute convergence implies that, independent of their characteristics, different economies will eventually converge to the same long-term level. With conditional convergence, all countries grow to their own steady state, which depends on underlying, country-specific, economic factors.

In two seminal contributions, Bernard and Durlauf (1995, 1996), drawing on Carlino and Mills (1993), develop the concept of "stochastic convergence". This entails that, in terms of economic variables, differences between countries will always have a transitory nature. Hence long-run forecasts of the differential between any pair of countries converge to zero, as the forecast interval increases (Oxley and Greasley, 1997).

Stochastic convergence can be present only if shocks to the disparity between two countries are temporary, in other words their effects dissipate over time. Hence, the stochastic approach to convergence is characterised by a testable inference: the differential series is stationary. Nonstationarity of the differential series implies that any shocks to this relative variable will have a long-lasting effect, accentuating the gap between countries. Evans and Karras (1996) show that in order to investigate the presence of stochastic convergence one can conduct standard unit root test for the differential series. If the null of a unit root cannot be rejected, then there is no convergence between the two countries involved in the calculation of the differential. Alternatively, if stationarity is supported by the results, then convergence is present.

Testing inflation convergence involves studying the dynamic properties of the inflation differential between two economies. If we let $\pi_{i,t}$ denote the inflation rate of country i at time t, then the inflation differential ($d_t^{i,b}$) between country i and a benchmark country b can be calculated as:

$$d_t^{i,b} = \pi_{i,t} - \pi_{b,t} \tag{1}$$

Stochastic convergence of country i's inflation rate towards the benchmark value implies that:

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} \mathrm{E}\,(d_{t+\tau}^{i,b} \mid \Omega_t) = \alpha \qquad , \forall t \tag{2}$$

where Ω_t denotes the information set available at time t, comprising current and past observations on the differential series. For $\alpha = 0$, expression (2) mirrors the definition of absolute inflation convergence in a stochastic environment, in the spirit of Bernard and Durlauf (1996). This definition states that absolute convergence entails equality of long-term forecasts of the two inflation series at any fixed point in time. Putting it in different words, inflation rates of two countries converge in absolute terms if the expected value of the difference between them tends to zero as time tends to infinity. If, in (2) above, α is different from zero, then convergence is conditional or relative (Durlauf and Quah, 1999), which implies that the two inflation series converge towards a time-invariant equilibrium differential.

As discussed above, an empirical test for stochastic inflation convergence can be implemented in a time series framework by examining the univariate properties of the inflation differential using a unit root test. Both absolute and conditional convergence require a stationary inflation differential. While absolute convergence implies that the auxiliary regression of the test does not include an intercept term, conditional convergence does not impose this restriction. As argued by Busetti et al. (2006), a simple time-series representation of conditional convergence is provided by a first-order autoregressive process:

$$d_t^{i,b} - \alpha = \rho\left(d_{t-1}^{i,b} - \alpha\right) + \varepsilon_{i,t} \tag{3}$$

which, parameterised in first differences, has the following expression:

$$\Delta d_t^{i,b} = \gamma + (\rho - 1)\, d_{t-1}^{i,b} + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{4}$$

where $\varepsilon_t^{'}$s are a sequence of martingale difference innovations, ρ represents the speed of convergence and $\gamma = \alpha(2-\rho)$ (where α is defined in (2) above). Representation (4) illustrates that the value of the growth rate of the inflation differential in the current period is a negative fraction of the inflation gap between two countries in the previous period, after allowing for a permanent difference (γ).

Expression (4) above corresponds to the maintained regression of the standard DF test. However, in empirical studies on inflation convergence, the ADF test, a generalisation of the DF test that accounts for serial correlation in the residuals, provides a more suitable representation. Commonly applied in univariate analyses of inflation convergence, the auxiliary regression of the ADF test requires additional lagged values of the inflation differential $\Delta d^{i,b}$ in specification (4) above, having the following expression:

$$\Delta d_t^{i,b} = \gamma + (\rho - 1)\, d_{t-1}^{i,b} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \varphi_{ij} \Delta d_{t-j}^{i,b} + \varepsilon_t \tag{5}$$

In the confines of representation (5), inflation convergence can be examined by conducting a unit root test, which evaluates the null hypothesis $H_0 : \rho = 1$, against the alternative $H_A : \rho < 1$. Müller and Elliott (2003) argue that the power properties of this unit root test depend on an initial condition, that is how far $d_0^{i,b}$ is from α. If the hypothesis under scrutiny is that of absolute convergence and consequently α is assumed to be equal to zero, a test based on an ADF regression with no intercept term performs relatively well, with a high initial value of the differential leading to enhanced power properties of the test (see Harvey and Bates, 2003 and Müller and Elliott, 2003, for a formal demonstration and Busetti et al., 2006, for an empirical illustration). As a result, a specification that does not include a constant term is appropriate for testing the null of no convergence against the alternative hypothesis that two inflation series are converging in absolute terms, since it provides an improvement in power. However, testing absolute convergence is of interest when inflation differentials pertain to countries that are already members of a monetary union. In this study, I will employ the conditional variant of convergence, this being appropriate in view of CEE countries' inflation history since the beginning of transition.

As highlighted in Section 2 of this paper, from a methodological standpoint, the focus of empirical studies on inflation convergence has gradually moved on from time series to panel data techniques. The latter provide more sophisticated devices to address the issue of convergence. In a panel setting, the time series dimension is augmented with the information contained in the cross-sectional one. This implies that nonstationarity from the time series can be dealt with and combined with the increased data and power that the cross-sectional dimension brings to the analysis. As a result, the inference about existence of unit roots, relevant to assessing convergence, becomes more accurate. Such outcome is particularly important in the case of CEE economies, where time series data are available over a short span, but similar data may be obtained across a cross-section of countries.

Panel unit root tests not only mediate the time dimension problem that arises in small samples, but are also characterised by enhanced power properties in comparison with their univariate counterparts. It is now a widely documented fact that commonly applied standard unit root tests, such as ADF, have low power in distinguishing the unit root null from a stationarity alternative, tending to over-reject the alternative of stationarity. In a convergence testing framework, this is equivalent to offering more empirical support to divergence between countries.

In this study, two panel unit root tests are conducted to assess the extent of convergence of CEE inflation rates. The first is the test proposed by Im, Pesaran and Shin (IPS, 1997, 2003), a test that addresses the convergence properties of a panel as a whole. The second test employed here, developed by Breuer, McNown and Wallace (SURADF, 2002) sheds light on the convergence performance of each panel member. These two testing frameworks complement each other, enabling one to derive convergence results not only for the panel as a whole, but also for individual countries. Their features facilitate a comprehensive analysis, which can focus on country-specific aspects. Moreover, both tests allow for heterogeneity in convergence rates.

To conduct the IPS test, an ADF-type regression is specified and estimated for each inflation differential, as follows:

$$\Delta d_t^{i,b} = X_{it}^{'}\gamma_i + \phi_i d_{t-1}^{i,b} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} c_{i,j}\Delta d_{t-j}^{i,b} + u_{i,t} \qquad (6)$$

where $i = 1,..., N$ and $t = 1,..., T$. N is the cross-sectional dimension of the panel, while T is the time dimension. X_{it} is a vector of deterministic components. In the framework of equation (6), the null hypothesis of a unit root, $H_0 : \phi_i = 0$, $\forall i$, is tested against the alternative $H_A : \phi_i < 0$, for $i = 1,..., N_1$ and $\phi_i = 0$, for $i = N_1 + 1,..., N$. Here, $\phi_i = \rho_i - 1$, where ρ_i is used as a measure of the speed of inflation convergence. The specification of the vector of deterministic components (X_{it}) is important in empirical applications. If no deterministic components are allowed in (6) above, then the IPS procedure tests absolute convergence between inflation rates, which is equivalent to assuming that the two inflation rates used in the calculation of the differential are characterised by identical steady states. When a constant term is included in (6), then one can distinguish two cases. In the first case, the constant is restricted to be equal across panel members ($X_{it} = 1$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = ... = \gamma_N = \gamma$), which suggests that inflation rates are characterised by the same growth rate. The second case allows different constant terms, which is equivalent with a model with fixed effects, suitable for representing conditional convergence. If the vector of deterministic components includes a constant and a term trend, where the constant is not the same across panel members, then there is a time-changing disparity between inflation rates

In the empirical analysis carried out in this paper, we include a constant term as the only deterministic component in the specification of (6) and, therefore, adopt a representation that corresponds to a model with fixed effects. From a conceptual viewpoint, this representation allows for idiosyncrasies and examines the evidence of conditional convergence in a framework characterised by heterogeneity across countries.

The t -bar test statistic proposed by Im, Pesaran and Shin (IPS, 1997, 2003) can be computed as an average of the *t*-statistics on the coefficients ϕ_i resulted from the estimation of ADF-type maintained regressions, illustrated in equation (6), for all countries in the panel.

An important drawback of the IPS testing technique is that it builds on the assumption that the error terms u_{it} in (6) are individually and identically distributed, IID (0, σ_ε^2). If the residual terms are contemporaneously correlated, this assumption is no longer valid, and the IPS test is characterised by significant size distortions, as demonstrated by Maddala and Wu (1999) and Strauss and Yigit (2003). To account for cross dependencies across panel members, Im, Pesaran and Shin (op.cit.) suggest the following solution: introduce a common time effect by decomposing the error term in (6) into a common time effect and an idiosyncratic random effect that is independently distributed across groups. To remove the common time effect, one needs to subtract the cross sectional mean from each panel member. However, simple demeaning to account for the presence of contemporaneous cross correlations does not remedy the size distortions in a satisfactory way (Strauss and Yigit, 2003).

Taylor and Sarno (1998) argue that panel unit root tests that focus on the stationarity properties of the panel as a whole, like the IPS test, have an important drawback: the null of (joint) nonstationarity might be rejected due to strong stationarity of one panel member, which induces rejection of the unit root null. This critique pertains to the results delivered by the IPS test, in cases where the panel under scrutiny comprises a mixture of convergent and non-convergent inflation rates. When the results of the IPS test are interpreted, if the sample test statistic exceeds its critical value(s), it may not be the case that all members of the panel are stationary. The IPS testing framework does not allow one to distinguish how many and which members of the panel contain a unit root, which may constitute a serious drawback.

One of the objectives of the analysis conducted here is to shed light on the individual experiences, in terms of inflation convergence performance, of the selected countries, while exploiting the advantages of panel approaches over univariate ones. To this end, we complement the IPS testing framework with the series specific panel unit root test proposed by Breuer, McNown and Wallace (SURADF, 2002). By employing a SUR framework, the testing procedure developed by Breuer, McNown and Wallace (op.cit.) leads to an improvement in the power of univariate time series tests, without sacrificing much series-specific information.

To conduct the SURADF test, ADF-type regressions, illustrated in (6) above, are specified for each panel member (similar to IPS). In a subsequent step, these regressions are estimated using a seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) approach, and individual unit root tests are conducted for each member of the panel. The SUR framework allows taking into consideration contemporaneous cross correlations among panel members, circumventing one of the drawbacks of the IPS test. The trade relations and institutional arrangements that exist among the CEE countries considered in this paper suggest that a panel unit root test that accounts for cross correlations is required to ensure an accurate assessment. Since it accounts for cross correlations among panel members, which are specific to each panel, the SURADF test statistic is characterised by a nonstandard distribution, and so the critical values of this test must be generated by Monte Carlo simulations tailored to the panel under scrutiny.

4. Data and Empirical Results

In this paper, we use a dataset that comprises monthly observations on prices (represented by CPIs) for the following countries: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia. The data are obtained from *International Financial Statistics* compiled by the International Monetary Fund. The data cover the interval January 1993 to December 2004. The pre-1993 period is excluded from analysis for two reasons: first, in order to avoid the early years of transition and the instability that characterised them and second, for countries which have gained separate identities only recently (like the Czech Republic and Slovakia), data are available only since January 1993. Therefore, to construct balanced panels, in line with the requirements of the panel unit root tests conducted in this study, the beginning of the sample is fixed at January 1993.

Based on the monthly CPI observations, we compute annualised[1] inflation rates as log differences:

$$\pi_t = \ln CPI_t - \ln CPI_{t-12} \tag{7}$$

Several reasons motivate our choice of countries. The first one is related to the common features that characterise their economies. The beginning of the 1990s marked a turning point in the evolution of these economies, representing the moment when the transition process from a communist system to a fully-fledged market economy started. This radical transformation required implementation of various fiscal and monetary policy actions within distinctive macroeconomic stabilization strategies. However, besides the inherent peculiarities of their stabilization attempts, the transition process undergone by these countries shared several common features, related mainly to

[1] Since we are using monthly observations on the consumer prices, annualisation is congruent to deseasonalisation

institutional reforms, price liberalization, the choice of an appropriate exchange rate regime, attempts to contain corrective inflation. At the same time, these economies endeavoured to establish a framework for international trade and cooperation to foster the transition process. They developed trade relations with each other and this fact provides a second reason to expect a certain degree of convergence within their groups. Bilateral trade relations, involving flows of capital and goods, play a coordinating role for the economic development of the countries involved. Ben-David (1996) provides insights into this issue, bringing evidence that income convergence among countries prevails as a feature of countries which engage in extensive trade relations with one another.

For the purposes of this empirical analysis, six panels are constructed as follows: *CEFTA*[2] (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia), the extended CEFTA (*ECEFTA*: the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia), the Baltic States (*BALTICS*: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania), the first wave group[3], comprising only former transition economies (*FIRST8*: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia), the complete first wave group (*FIRST10*: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia) and a panel that includes all former transition economies (*ALL9*: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia). Therefore, we form panels based on both institutional and geographical criteria.

To examine inflation convergence, we calculate inflation differentials of the selected countries with respect to the following four benchmarks: Germany, Greece, the Euro area and their group average, where the groups are those described above. Germany is chosen as a benchmark to represent the core EU standards, since it has a remarkable experience in terms of low inflation. In this regard, this work is related to that on Bundesbank's domination of the EMS (see, for example, von Hagen and Fratianni, 1990, Karfakis and Moschos, 1990, MacDonald and Taylor, 1991, Kutan, 1991, Kirchgässner and Wolters, 1993 and Hafer et al., 1997). Greece, a more recent member of the EMU, is chosen to represent the peripheral countries of the Union and facilitate comparisons between results. Since Germany and Greece have been used as benchmarks by other convergence studies (Brada and Kutan, 2001; Brada et al., 2002; Kutan and Yigit, 2004), we introduce a third benchmark, representative for an average inflation rate for the Euro area, calculated based on a weighted average CPI for the Euro area, reported by Eurostat.

Table 1 provides some descriptive statistics, such as averages and standard deviations, for the inflation rates considered in this study. Looking at the average values, we can see that the lowest average inflation rate prevailed in Germany, followed by the Euro zone. Not surprisingly, inflation tended over this period to be higher in the transition economies than elsewhere.

---

[2] CEFTA represents the acronym for the Central European Free Trade Agreement, signed by former Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland on December 21, 1992. On March 1st, 1993, CEFTA goes into effect. On January, 1st, 1996, Slovenia joins CEFTA as a full member. On July 1st, 1997, Romania also joins CEFTA.

[3] I adopt this terminology in order to distinguish between the first wave of new member states, which entered EU on 1 May 2004 (Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia) and the second wave, which comprises Bulgaria and Romania.

[insert Table 1 here]

Univariate Unit Root Test Results

To test for mean-reverting behaviour (beta convergence) in inflation differentials, we start by conducting the standard ADF unit root test. This test will also serve as a benchmark for comparison for the results of subsequent panel unit root tests and assist in the selection of the lag order for the specification of panel-based unit root tests.

If we can reject the null hypothesis of a unit root and therefore detect stationarity (and convergence), any shock that causes deviations from equilibrium[4] has a temporary nature and its impact will eventually die out. The speed at which this process takes place can be directly derived using the estimated value of the speed of convergence ($\hat{\rho}$). Given $\hat{\rho}$, half-lives (HL) can be calculated using the following formula:

$$HL = \frac{\ln(0.5)}{\ln(\hat{\rho})} \tag{8}$$

[insert Table 2 here]

The results of the univariate ADF test suggest that, with only a few exceptions, the inflation differentials examined in this study are unit root processes. The only country which appears consistently to have a unit root in the inflation differential is Romania; this is likely due to the particularly large mean differential observed for this country over the study period. However, since this limited support for convergence may be due to the low power that characterises the ADF test, in what follows we present results derived from a panel framework.

Panel Unit Root Test Results

Table 3 reports the results of the Im, Pesaran and Shin (1997, 2003) t-bar test for each benchmark inflation rate and panel of countries. After calculating the standardised version of this test statistic, its level of significance is determined using critical values drawn from a standard normal distribution.

[insert Table 3 here]

The null hypothesis of a unit root is rejected for all benchmarks and lag values for four panels: BALTICS, FIRST8, ALL9, FIRST10. However, for the CEFTA and ECEFTA panels, the results are conditional on the selected lag length and benchmark inflation rate. It may be the strong rejection of nonstationarity for the Baltic States that drives these results, if we look also at the CEFTA and ECEFTA results.

---

[4] Proxied, as mentioned above, by the benchmark value of inflation.

[insert Table 4 here]

Table 4 presents two measures of convergence: the speed of convergence (ρ) and the corresponding half-life (HL). The convergence coefficient (ρ) represents a measure of the speed of convergence. The closer ρ is to 1, the slower the convergence of the inflation rate to the chosen benchmark value. Interpreted in terms of the half life of shocks, convergence is faster when the value of the half life is smaller, which implies that the impact of a shock causing a deviation from equilibrium (proxied by the benchmark value) will die out more rapidly. Table 4 shows that regardless of the inflation benchmark considered, convergence is faster in the case of the new EU members that had a longer history as fully-fledged market economies, Cyprus and Malta. They are followed by Slovakia, Slovenia and two of the Baltic States, Latvia and Lithuania. Convergence is definitely slower in the cases of Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Romania and Lithuania.

The second panel of Table 4 reports average values of the speed of convergence and half-lives for the six panels examined in this study. They suggest that when the benchmark inflation value is the German inflation, convergence is fastest for the panel that comprises the new EU members (FIRST10), followed by CEFTA. The Baltic panel is characterised by the slowest convergence. A change in the benchmark value of inflation to the Greek inflation changes the ranking, with CEFTA and ECEFTA panels showing the fastest convergence and the Baltics the slowest. If the benchmark is an average Euro zone inflation rate, then convergence is fastest for the new EU members (FIRST10), followed by CEFTA and ECEFTA.. The panel with the Baltic states is again characterised by the lowest speed of convergence.

In view of the sensitivity of some of the above results to lag length, and to examine the inflation convergence performance of each country, it is instructive to employ also the SURADF test, which allows a more flexible approach in terms of lag specification. In the representation of this test, we use different lag structures for each panel member, where the lags are the same as those used in the specification of the univariate ADF test. They are determined, as before, by employing the data dependent, top-down procedure devised by Campbell and Perron (1991). Table 5 displays the findings of the SURADF testing approach when inflation convergence is tested against a German inflation benchmark.

[insert Table 5 here]

When the benchmark is represented by Germany, convergence in inflation rates occurs consistently for Poland and Slovenia (in five out of six panels) and also for two Baltic economies, Estonia and Latvia (in four out of six panels). In the case of the new EU member states with tradition as market economies, convergence in inflation rates to the German benchmark occurs for Cyprus, while Malta is close to converging. The results indicate that the Slovak Republic is also close to converging, while the Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania do not exhibit convergence in any of the panels. Lithuania displays convergence only in the Baltics panel, which shows the greatest degree of homogeneity among all panels considered in this study, with all three members converging in their inflation rates to the German benchmark. These findings are, in general, in accord with those of Kutan and Yigit (2004), who study the inflation convergence performance of the ten new EU member states with respect to Germany using the SURADF test. However, they consider a shorter sample period, which ends in December 2003.

[insert Table 6 here]

Table 6 illustrates the inflation convergence performance of the countries included in this study when the benchmark economy is represented by Greece, the last country to join the EMU structures. In comparison with Germany, Greece exhibited higher inflation rates throughout the interval under scrutiny. In various empirical assessments, Greece is generally viewed as a peripheral EMU economy. This being so, the macroeconomic performance of the Central and Eastern European EMU candidates is often compared to that of Greece.

When the benchmark economy is Greece, convergence in inflation rates occurs consistently for Estonia and Latvia (in all panels that include them). Poland also exhibits convergence, while Slovenia is close to converging. Similar to the case when Germany is selected as benchmark, the Baltic panel displays the highest degree of homogeneity, with all three Baltic States converging. However, when other countries are included, Lithuania ceases to exhibit convergence. The change in benchmark does not alter, in qualitative terms, the results obtained in the cases of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania. Slovakia is, in all panels, closer to converging than these three economies. The inflation rates of Cyprus and Malta do not exhibit convergence to the Greek one, which shows that, in their cases, a change in the benchmark matters for the inflation convergence performance.

[insert Table 7 here]

When a Euro area average inflation rate is considered as benchmark value, convergence occurs in the cases of Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Poland and Slovenia. The Baltic panel exhibits again the highest degree of homogeneity, in that all three inflation rates converge to the Euro area benchmark. Slovenia converges, albeit at 10%. Lithuania is close to convergence. Negative results in terms of convergence are uncovered for the Czech Republic, Hungary, Malta and Romania.

To summarise the results reported so far, the empirical evidence consistently shows that a number of countries, namely Estonia, Latvia and Poland display inflation convergence regardless of the Euro area inflation benchmark considered. At the other end of the convergence spectrum, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania do not exhibit convergence in inflation rates to any of these benchmarks. The evolution of inflation in Romania, with values that peaked several times as a result of several unsuccessful stabilization attempts and remained in the double-digit range until 2004, may justify its poor performance in terms of inflation convergence. In the cases of Czech Republic and Hungary, an explanation is more difficult to find. The Czech inflation rates have constantly been below those recorded by Estonia, which displayed a consistent inflation convergence. Therefore, in the light of this argument, an explanation may be sought in the way inflation convergence is defined from the viewpoint of an applied econometrics approach, as a process of lessening of differentials. This may be complemented with insights offered by a look at patterns in the evolution of inflation over the sample under scrutiny, which reveals a rather volatile evolution of Czech inflation over the period analysed, with values that have been much below the benchmark in some years and much above them in others. For Hungary, a possible explanation also lies in the inflation patterns during the interval under scrutiny, with several reversions in trend and a rather disappointing inflation performance over the past few years. Compared with the other countries considered in this analysis, Lithuania has represented an outlier in terms of inflation performance. In spite of this, the results indicate that in a panel which also includes the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania exhibits convergence in terms of inflation to all three benchmarks considered. This may be due to the strong correlations that exist among the three Baltic economies, correlations that have been accounted for by the testing methodology applied in this study.

A fourth benchmark employed in this study is represented by the average inflation of the groups considered. The results pertaining to convergence to these benchmarks are presented in Table 8.

[insert Table 8 here]

The results of inflation convergence to the group average illustrate that the strongest convergence occurs in the case of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania), which form the most homogeneous panel, a finding that reinforces previous results. At the other extreme are situated the CEFTA and ECEFTA panels, where, with the exception of Poland, the member countries do not converge in their inflation rates to the group average. The panel that comprises the eight CEE economies which joined the EU in May 2004 also evinces a high degree of homogeneity, in that convergence to the group's average inflation occurs for five countries (the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland and the Slovak Republic), while the other three (Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia) are characterised by divergence. This result supports, to some extent, their admittance into EU as a group. However, one can notice that countries that exhibit convergence to this group's inflation average are, with the exception of the Slovak Republic, those who formed the initial first wave of accession economies. Latvia and Lithuania were initially members of the second wave. Their upgrading to the first wave of accession was decided based on their macroeconomic performance. However, their performance in terms of convergence to the average inflation of the group may suggest that their inflation experiences may have been different from those of the other first wave CEE economies.

Adding Romania to the group that comprises the other eight former transition countries does not significantly change the results, except for one rather puzzling outcome: convergence in inflation rate to the group's average also occurs in the case of Romania, besides the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary and Poland. As it is evident that Romania represents more of an outlier within this group, the impact of its high inflation rates on the group's average may solve the puzzle.

The panel that comprises the ten new EU members is also characterised by homogeneity, with most of its members (the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Poland and Slovenia) converging to the group's average inflation. This result tends to support their accession to EU as a group.

Assessing the Potential for Nonlinear Inflation Convergence

In what follows, to complement the results reported so far, we add a new dimension to the empirical analysis performed in this study, by investigating the potential presence of nonlinear features in the inflation convergence process. A nonlinear adjustment is characterised by changes in the speed of convergence. Panel methods, which belong to the family of linear modelling frameworks, cannot account for this feature. In the applied econometrics literature, nonlinear representations have mainly been used to illustrate the dynamic adjustment of the real exchange rates to equilibrium or the dynamics of macroeconomic variables over the business cycle. However, their main features make them suitable for assessing potential changes in the speed of inflation convergence.

In designing a modelling framework, which considers not only a linear adjustment but also a nonlinear one, we build on a remark made by Beck and Weber (2005) who, using regional data, investigate the dynamics of inflation convergence in the Euro zone before and after the introduction of the single currency. They apply the panel unit root test developed by Levin and Lin (1992, 1993) and find evidence in support of mean reversion (beta-convergence) in inflation rates for both subsamples. The estimated convergence speed (common for all panel units) indicates a large value for the half life of shocks. Moreover, the results indicate that the speed of convergence has decreased after the introduction of a common monetary policy. These findings motivate Beck and Weber (op.cit.) to discuss the possibility of a process with nonlinear features that would accurately describe the documented change in the speed of convergence. However, they do not proceed any further to formally test for the presence of nonlinearities in the dynamics of convergence.

Intuitively, a nonlinear adjustment makes sense if one considers the EU accession, in May 2004, of the economies considered in this study. Nonlinearities may have been induced by policy actions, when more effective disinflationary measures have been implemented by the CEE monetary authorities to ensure compliance with EU benchmarks. Such policy interventions are likely to increase the speed of convergence, as their main objective is to bring inflation down when it surpasses a certain threshold. Moreover, the nonlinear adjustment induced by policy actions may also be characterised by asymmetry, as policy makers are more concerned about increases in inflation than declines. Furthermore, as suggested by Killian and Taylor (2001) for the case of exchange rates, heterogeneity of economic agents' beliefs and expectations could induce nonlinearity. A similar argument may apply also in the case of inflation rates, given the crucial role played by inflation expectations, especially in the case of the European former transition economies. The potential for nonlinear convergence of CEE countries' inflation rates towards EU benchmarks is examined here in an attempt to shed more light on the results delivered by linear modelling frameworks used so far in this paper.

The investigation of nonlinear features in the inflation convergence of the case study countries considered in this paper is carried out for the inflation differentials calculated with respect to Germany. This choice is motivated by the arguments in favour of nonlinearity presented above, which suggest that German inflation is more likely to be viewed as a benchmark by the monetary authorities of the countries that aspire to become EMU members.

To examine the presence of nonlinearities, we apply a battery of linearity tests, developed by Luukkonen et al. (1988), Teräsvirta (1994) and Escribano and Jorda (1998, 2001). These tests are conducted to investigate a potential nonlinear adjustment of a Smooth Transition Auto Regressive (STAR) type. A linear specification, similar to those used by the univariate and panel unit root tests carried out in this paper, is assessed against the alternative of STAR-type nonlinearity. To avoid a spurious finding of nonlinearity that may be due to the presence of outliers, quite likely to exist given the inflation experiences of the CEE economies, we implement both the standard and the outlier-robust versions of these tests. For a thorough investigation, heteroscedasticity robust linearity tests are also conducted. The detailed results of this sequence of tests are reported in the appendix to this paper.

Table 9 summarises the results of the battery of linearity tests presented in Appendix, by indicating the STAR specification that is most likely to characterise the convergence of CEE countries inflation rates to a German benchmark if nonlinear features are present in the adjustment process. Moreover, the table sheds light on the type of adjustment: asymmetric, if a Logistic STAR (LSTAR) specification is suggested as most likely by the linearity tests, or symmetric, if an Exponential STAR (ESTAR) might represent a more adequate representation.

[insert Table 9 here]

The results of the battery of linearity tests conducted provide evidence in support of a nonlinear convergence in inflation rates for eight out of eleven countries included in the sample under scrutiny. Exceptions are the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia. In analysing the outcome of these tests, we place more emphasis on their outlier-robust versions, given the patterns in the evolution of inflation rates in CEE countries over the decade 1993-2004. An asymmetric, LSTAR-type nonlinear adjustment may provide an adequate description of the inflation convergence process in the cases of Hungary, Latvia, Malta and Romania. ESTAR models are suitable for Cyprus, Estonia, Lithuania, Romania and Slovenia. In the case of Hungary, the outcome of the linearity tests may explain why convergence was not unveiled by the univariate and panel unit root tests that adopted a linear specification. Furthermore, the case of Romania highlights the importance of performing outlier-robust linearity tests in order to avoid a spurious finding of nonlinearity. In terms of inflation experience, among the countries considered in this analysis, Romania stands out, with high and volatile inflation rates. However, the outlier-robust linearity tests performed here suggest that there is potential for nonlinear convergence in the case of the Romanian inflation rate.

Note: the final version of the paper will also include the specification and estimation of the nonlinear models in Table 9.

5. The Inflation Convergence Record: a Look at Potential Explanatory Factors

The main finding of the empirical analysis performed above is that convergence in inflation rates of CEE countries to EU benchmarks occurs only in a limited number of cases. Moreover, the results are country-specific and benchmark-specific. An interpretation of the whole picture is difficult. This is not surprising, given the inflation experiences of the CEE economies during the period 1993 to 2004. While the established market economies of Cyprus and Malta make better candidates for convergence, the former transition economies from Central and Eastern Europe offer a rather mixed picture. To explain the results, we evaluate a number of factors that may exert an impact on the convergence process.

First, the experience of current EMU members provides a very useful arena for examining the factors that underlie inflation convergence. In particular, the experience of the peripheral countries may help in drawing lessons for the CEE countries that aspire to join the monetary union.

In recent European economic history, two landmarks stand out. The first one corresponds to the establishment of the EMS in 1979, with the intention of stabilising exchange rate volatility among members. The second marks the adoption of a single currency and the introduction of a common monetary policy, in 1999, marking the last stage in the creation of the economic and monetary union.

The prospect of introducing a single currency within EU has required synchronisation of monetary decisions taken by the member states. This has provided the impetus for the establishment of a regulatory framework, which ranged from the EMS of 1979, with its own exchange rate mechanism (ERM I), to the Maastricht Treaty of 1992. Among other nominal convergence criteria, the Maastricht Treaty has defined explicit convergence goals for inflation rates. However, after the commencement of the Euro, a proliferating inflation divergence has been documented and significant cross-country differences have emerged. A large body of studies have addressed this topic, trying to shed light on the nature of the observed divergence (short or long lasting) and the factors that caused it. To explain this change in trend, it has been emphasised that inflation rates experienced a firm decrease as countries endeavoured to comply with the Maastricht inflation criterion. After that, the inception of a single monetary policy generated divergence in inflation rates, as a one size policy could not fit all experiences. If one looks at the developments discussed above in the light of the future EMU accession of the new EU member states, then more divergence can be expected to occur, as these countries will contribute to an increase in the already existing heterogeneity among member states.

Secondly, within the confines of the EMU, increased goods market integration and greater price transparency, generated by the Internal Market Programme and, ultimately, by the introduction of a single currency, aimed at stimulating price convergence. However, as documented by Maier and Cavelaars (2003), Euro area countries have adopted a common currency, but are still characterised by different price levels for similar products. The large body of literature that focuses on testing the validity of PPP offers an explanation for this, showing that price levels between countries tend to equalise, but the adjustment process is very slow[5] (see, for instance, Froot and Rogoff, 1995).

Within a monetary union, if prices expressed in a common currency reveal initial differences across countries, then convergence to a similar level entails higher inflation in countries with lower prices. Therefore, price level convergence, also labeled as "inflation catching up" may hinder the inflation convergence process by generating cross-country differences in inflation rates (Rogers et al., 2001; Rogers, 2002).

The differences in price levels between the euro area and the countries that aspire to join it are more pronounced than price differentials within the euro area. This suggests that the phenomenon of price convergence may constitute an important source of inflation differentials between current EMU members and aspiring countries.

Thirdly, an important aspect of the price convergence process concerns adjustments in the area of nontradable goods prices. The well-known Balassa Samuelson

[5] Price differences between countries tend to equalise, where these differences reflect certain costs.

(BS) effect is often put forward in attempts to explain why prices of nontradable goods might increase faster in poorer members of a monetary union, therefore generating inflation differentials with respect to richer members. The process of economic integration witnessed by CEECs has created pressure for European-wide convergence of productivity levels in the tradable goods sector. In addition, productivity levels in the nontradable goods sector have converged at a much slower rate. Therefore, productivity increases in the tradable goods sector have outpaced those in the nontradables sector. Due to wage equalisation (an important assumption of the BS effect), the rise in wages in the tradables sector has determined an increase in wages, and hence prices, in the nontradables sector of CEECs, compared to the old EU members. The rise in inflation that has occurred due to high nontradable goods inflation explains, partly, the divergence in inflation between CEECs and old EU members.

Fourthly, the features of the monetary regime pursued by a country may be relevant for the inflation convergence process. This conjecture stems from the main tenet of the monetarist paradigm, which, in the words of Milton Friedman, upholds that inflation is always and everywhere a monetary phenomenon.

A fifth aspect that may shed some light on the inflation convergence performance of EMU accession countries is the design of fiscal policy. Kutan and Yigit (2004) argue that when CPI is used to calculate inflation rates, the stance of fiscal policy becomes relevant in interpreting inflation convergence results, since the CPI accounts for fiscal shocks.

6. Conclusions

In this paper we reported on a comprehensive econometric assessment of inflation convergence of CEE countries towards EU benchmarks and their group averages. After gaining the status of fully fledged market economies, these countries have been accepted as members of EU and intend eventually to subscribe to EMU, legitimating an assessment of their inflation performance. However, their participation in the monetary union is conditional upon complying with a strict inflation criterion. To meet this criterion, the CEE countries have strived to build the appropriate institutions and implement consistent, sound and coordinated monetary and fiscal policies. Containing inflation and maintaining price stability has become increasingly important for these countries. In this context, convergence of inflation becomes a topic of key importance.

The results reported in this paper suggest that while convergence can be revealed in a number of cases, there is some sensitivity associated with the testing framework, in particular whether time series or panel methods are used. Furthermore, the inflation convergence performance of the CEE countries is conditional on the chosen inflation benchmark, the composition of the panel and the correlations among members. The highest degree of homogeneity was recorded for the panel comprising the three Baltic States. Poland and Slovenia were the other CEE countries with a good performance in terms of inflation convergence.

To complement the results derived from univariate and panel unit root tests, we conducted a set of linearity tests on the inflation differentials with respect to Germany, chosen to represent EMU core. In this regard, the analysis performed in this paper was characterised by an element of novelty, compared with other existing studies. While accounting for the interplay between linearity and outliers, the findings of the linearity tests highlighted a potential nonlinear convergence process in all but one case, which may have been induced not only by policy interventions, but also by heterogeneity of inflation expectations among economic agents. This finding opens an interesting line of inquiry, suggesting that the process of inflation convergence in the CEE countries is characterised by nonlinear features, which cannot be captured by standard linear models. The results reported here suggest that nonlinear convergence, which allows for more flexibility in comparison with linear specifications, is almost ubiquitous. Therefore, an accurate representation of the convergence process of the CEE economies towards EMU norms needs to accommodate the presence of nonlinear features.

References

Amian, C.G., and A.M. Zumaquero (2002), "Complete or partial inflation convergence in the EU?", Working Paper No.9, Centro de Estudios Andaluces, Sevilla.

Barro, R.J. (1991), "Economic growth in a cross section of countries", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106, 407-443.

Barro, R.J., and X. Sala-i-Martin (1991), "Convergence across states and regions", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1, 107-158.

Barro, R.J., and X. Sala-i-Martin (1992), "Convergence", *Journal of Political Economy*, 100, 223-251.

Baumol, W. (1986), "Productivity growth, convergence, and welfare: what the long-run data show", *American Economic Review*, 76, 1072-1085.

Beck, G.W., and A. A. Weber (2005), "Price stability, inflation convergence and diversity in EMU: does one size fit all?", CFS Working Paper No. 30, Center for Financial Studies, Frankfurt.

Ben-David, D. (1996), "Trade and convergence among countries", *Journal of International Economics*, 40, 279-298.

Bernard, A.B., and S.N. Durlauf (1995), "Convergence in international output", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 10, 97-108.

Bernard, A.B., and S.N. Durlauf (1996), "Interpreting tests of the convergence hypothesis", *Journal of Econometrics*, 71, 161-173.

Brada, J.C., Kutan, A.M., and S. Zhou (2002), "Real and monetary convergence within the European Union and between the European Union and candidate countries: A rolling cointegration approach", Working Paper No. 548, William Davidson Institute, University of Michigan Stephen M. Ross Business School.

Brada, J.C., and A.M. Kutan (2001), "The convergence of monetary policy between candidate countries and the European Union", Working Paper No. 7, Centre for European Integration Studies, Bonn University.

Brada, J.C., and A.M. Kutan, (2002), "Balkan and Mediterranean candidates for European Union membership: the convergence of their monetary policy with that of the European Central Bank", Working Paper No. 456, William Davidson Institute, University of Michigan Stephen M. Ross Business School.

Breuer, J.B., McNown, R., and M. Wallace (2002), "Series specific unit root tests with panel data", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 64, 527-546.

Bulíř, A., and J. Hurnik (2006), "The Maastricht inflation criterion: How unpleasant is purgatory?", *Economic Systems*, 30, 385-404.

Busetti, F., Forni, L., Harvey, A., and F. Venditti (2006), "Inflation convergence and divergence within the European Monetary Union", Working Paper No. 574, European Central Bank, Frankfurt.

Campbell, J.Y., and P. Perron (1991), "Pitfalls and opportunities: what macroeconomists should know about unit roots", Technical Working Paper No. 100, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Caporale, G.M., and N. Pittis (1993), "Common stochastic trends and inflation convergence in the EMS", *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 129, 207-215.
Carlino, G.A., and L. Mills (1993), "Are U.S. regional incomes converging? A time series analysis", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32, 335-346.
Durlauf, S., and D. Quah (1999), "The new empirics of economic growth", *Econometrica*, 71, 1269-1286.
Égert. B., Ritzberger-Gruenwald, D., and M. A. Silgoner (2004), "Inflation differentials in Europe: Past experience and future prospects", *Monetary Policy and the Economy,* Oesterreichische Nationalbank (Austrian Central Bank), issue 1, 47-72.
Escribano, A., and O. Jordá (1998), "Improved testing and specification of smooth transition regression models", in P. Rothman (ed.) *Dynamic modeling and econometrics in economics and finance, vol.1: nonlinear time series analysis of economic and financial data*, Kluwer Academic Press, Boston, 289-319.
Escribano, A., and O.Jordá (2001), "Decision rules for selecting between exponential and logistic STAR", *Spanish Economic Review*, 3, 193-210.
Evans, P., and G. Karras (1996), "Convergence revisited", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 37, 249-265.
Froot, K.A. and K.S. Rogoff (1995), "Perspective on PPP and long-run real exchange rates", in Grossman, G. and K. Rogoff (eds.), *Handbook of International Economics*, Vol.3, 1647-1688, Elsevier, Amsterdam.
Granger, C.W.J., and T. Teräsvirta (1993), *Modelling nonlinear economic relationships*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
Hafer, R.W., Kutan, A.M., and S. Zhou (1997), "Linkage in EMS term structures: evidence from common trend and transitory components", *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 16, 595-607.
Hall, S., Robertson, D., and M. Wickens (1992), "Measuring convergence of the EC economies", *The Manchester School*, 60, 99-111.
Hansen, B.E. (1996), "Inference when a nuisance parameter is not identified under the null hypothesis", *Econometrica*, 64, 413-430.
Harvey, A.C., and D. Bates (2003), "Multivariate unit root tests and testing for convergence", Working Paper No.1, Department of Applied Economics, University of Cambridge.
Holmes, M.J. (1998), "Inflation convergence in the ERM: evidence for manufacturing and services", *International Economic Journal*, 12, 1-16.
Im, K.S., Hasem Pesaran, M., and Y. Shin (1997), "Testing for unit roots in heterogenous panels", Working Paper, Department of Applied Economics, University of Cambridge.
Im, K.S., Pesaran, M.H., and Y. Shin (2003), "Testing for unit roots in heterogeneous panels", *Journal of Econometrics*, 115, 53-74.
Karfakis, C.J., and D.M. Moschos (1990), "Interest rate linkages within the European Monetary System: a time series analysis," *Journal of Money*, *Credit and Banking*, 22, 388-394.
Killian, L., and M.P. Taylor (2003), "Why is it so difficult to beat the random walk for exchange rates?", *Journal of International Economics*, 60, 85-107.
Kirchgassner, G., and J. Wolters (1993), "Does the DM dominate the Euro market? An empirical investigation", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 75, 773-778.
Kočenda, E. (2001), "Macroeconomic convergence in transition countries", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 29, 1-23.
Kočenda, E., and D.H. Papell (1997), "Inflation convergence within the European Union: a panel data analysis", *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 2, 189-198.
Kočenda, E., Kutan, A.M., and T.M. Yigit (2006), "Pilgrims to the Eurozone: how far, how fast?", *Economic Systems*, 30, 311-327.
Koedijk, K.G., and J.M.C. Kool (1992), "Dominant interest and inflation differentials within the EMS", *European Economic Review*, 36, 925-943.
Kutan, A.M. (1991), "German dominance in the European Monetary System: evidence from money supply growth rates", *Open Economies Review*, 2, 285-294.

Kutan, A.M., and T.M. Yigit (2002), "Nominal and real stochastic convergence within the transition economies and the European Monetary Union: evidence from panel data", Working Paper No.6, Emergent Markets Group, Cass Business School, London.

Kutan, A.M., and T.M. Yigit (2004), "Nominal and real stochastic convergence of transition economies", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 32, 23-36.

Levin, A., and C. Lin (1992), "Unit root tests in panel data: asymptotic and finite-sample properties", Discussion Paper No. 23, University of California at San Diego.

Levin, A., and C. Lin (1993), "Unit root tests in panel data: new results", Discussion Paper No. 56, University of California at San Diego.

Luukkonen, R., Saikkonen, P., and T. Teräsvirta (1988), "Testing linearity against smooth transition models", *Biometrika*, 75, 491-499.

MacDonald, R., and M.P. Taylor (1991), "Exchange rates, policy convergence, and the European Monetary System", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 73, 553-558.

Maddala, G.S., and S. Wu (1999), "A comparative study of unit root tests with panel data and a new simple test", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 61, 631-652.

Maier, P., and P. Cavelaars (2003), "EMU enlargement and convergence of price levels: lessons from the German reunification", Working Paper No. 6, Monetary and Economic Policy Department, Netherlands Central Bank, Amsterdam.

Mentz, M. and S.P. Sebastian (2003), "Inflation convergence after the introduction of the Euro", Working Paper No. 30, Center for Financial Studies, Frankfurt.

Müller, U.K., and G. Elliott (2003), "Tests for unit roots and the initial condition", *Econometrica*, 71, 1269-1286.

Oxley, L., and D. Greasley (1997), "Time-series based tests of the convergence hypothesis: some positive results", *Economics Letters*, 56, 143-147.

Pirovano, M., and A. Van Poeck (2011), "Eurozone inflation differentials and the ECB", Working Paper 2011014, Faculty of Applied Economics.

Rangvid, J., and C. Sorensen (2002), "Convergence in the ERM and declining numbers of common stochastic trends", *Journal of Emerging Market Finance*, 1, 183–213.

Rogers, J.H. (2002), "Monetary union, price level convergence and inflation: how close is Europe to the United States?", International Finance Discussion Paper No. 740, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington.

Rogers, J.H., Hufbauer, G.C., and E. Wada (2001), "Price level convergence and inflation in Europe", Working Paper No. 1, Institute for International Economics, Washington.

Saikkonen, P., and R. Luukkonen (1988), "Lagrange multiplier tests for testing non-linearities in time series models", *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 15, 55-68.

Siklos, P., and M.E. Wohar (1997), "Convergence in interest rates and inflation rates across countries and over time", *Review of International Economics*, 5, 129-141.

Strauss, J., and T.M. Yigit (2003), "Shortfalls of panel unit root testing" *Economics Letters*, 81, 309-313.

Taylor, M.P., and L. Sarno (1998), "The behaviour of real exchange rates during the post-Bretton Woods period", *Journal of International Economics*, 46, 281-312.

Teräsvirta, T. (1994), "Specification, estimation and evaluation of smooth transition autoregressive models", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89, 208- 218.

Thom, R. (1995), "Inflation convergence in the EMS: some additional evidence. A comment", *Review of International Economics*, 131, 577-586.

von Hagen, J., and M. Fratianni (1990), "German dominance in the EMS: evidence from interest rates", *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 9, 358-375.

Westbrook, J. A. (1998), "Monetary integration, inflation convergence and output shocks in the European Monetary System", *Economic Inquiry*, 36, 138-144.

Tables

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for inflation rates

Country	Average	Standard deviation
CY	2.96	1.24
CZ	5.49	3.6
ES	11.26	11.72
HU	12.5	6.63
LA	9.12	9.46
LI	11.9	19.2
MA	2.6	1.2
PO	11.4	9.01
RO	40.55	29.11
SVK	7.94	3.07
SVL	8.68	4.17
GE	1.52	0.62
GR	5.07	2.6
EZ	1.98	0.53

Notes: the table reports summary statistics (average and standard deviation) of inflation rates as percentage values. CY=Cyprus, CZ=Czech Republic, ES=Estonia, HU=Hungary, LA=Latvia, LI=Lithuania, MA=Malta, PO=Poland, RO=Romania, SVK=Slovakia, SVL=Slovenia, GE=Germany, GR=Greece, EZ=Euro zone.

Table 2 Univariate ADF unit root test results

Panel A. Benchmark: Germany

Country	k	ρ	HL	t-stat
CY	1	0.740	2.30	-4.037^{***}
CZ	1	0.980	34.98	-1.195
ES	1	0.981	37.09	-2.319
HU	2	0.994	118.77	-0.704
LA	1	0.980	33.90	-2.336
LI	8	0.981	36.40	-2.221
MA	1	0.810	3.29	-3.331^{**}
PO	5	0.983	41.26	-2.246
RO	1	0.962	17.72	-3.147^{**}
SVK	0	0.938	10.87	-2.235
SVL	1	0.978	31.03	-1.522

Panel B. Benchmark: Greece

Country	k	ρ	HL	t-stat
CY	5	0.941	11.37	-1.955
CZ	0	0.958	16.15	-1.665
ES	1	0.977	29.48	-2.288
HU	3	0.982	38.81	-1.506
LA	1	0.974	26.03	-2.268
LI	8	0.975	27.89	-2.260
MA	2	0.946	12.54	-2.160
PO	4	0.983	40.28	-1.658
RO	1	0.960	16.98	-3.139^{**}
SVK	0	0.959	16.65	-1.654
SVL	0	0.960	16.80	-1.748

Panel C. Benchmark: Euro area

Country	k	ρ	HL	t-stat
CY	1	0.763	0.21	-3.764^{***}
CZ	1	0.981	3.07	-1.239
ES	3	0.975	2.25	-3.483^{**}
HU	2	0.995	11.59	-0.669
LA	1	0.979	2.80	-2.400
LI	8	0.979	2.76	-2.328
MA	1	0.875	0.43	-2.638
PO	6	0.985	3.73	-2.192
RO	5	0.964	1.56	-2.990^{**}
SVK	1	0.934	0.85	-2.473
SVL	1	0.978	2.60	-1.663

Notes: k denotes the lag length selected for the ADF specification (determined using the data-driven procedure suggested by Campbell and Perron, 1991, with an upper bound of 8, given the short time dimension of the sample), ρ is the speed of convergence, while HL represents the half-life of shocks. The half-lives are expressed in months and indicate how many months it takes for a shock to the inflation differential to dissipate by a half. The auxiliary regression of the ADF test contains a constant as the only deterministic component. Country codes are given in Table 1. *** indicates significance at 1%, ** at 5% and * at 10%.

Table 3: IPS test results for inflation differentials

Panel A Benchmark: Germany

Lag	CEFTA	ECEFTA	BALTICS	FIRST8 CEECs	ALL 9 CEECs	FIRST10
1	-1.401	-1.692	-3.400***	-2.150***	-2.261***	-2.457***
2	-1.565	-1.894	-3.314***	-2.221***	-2.367***	-2.526***
3	-1.753	-2.050*	-3.733***	-2.496***	-2.608***	-2.671***
4	-1.696	-1.751	-3.795***	-2.483***	-2.432***	-2.671***
5	-1.934	-2.107**	-3.494***	-2.519***	-2.569***	-2.685***
6	-2.089*	-2.221***	-3.610***	-2.659***	-2.684***	-2.796***
7	-2.202**	-2.34***	-4.276***	-2.980***	-2.985***	-3.135***
8	-2.444***	-2.484***	-3.815***	-2.958***	-2.928***	-3.104***

Panel B Benchmark: Greece

Lag	CEFTA	ECEFTA	BALTICS	FIRST8 CEECs	ALL9 CEECs	FIRST10
1	-1.566	-1.828	-3.587***	-2.324***	-2.415***	-2.248***
2	-1.775	-2.093**	-3.599***	-2.459***	-2.595***	-2.32***
3	-2.01	-2.272***	-3.534***	-2.582***	-2.693***	-2.427***
4	-2.007	-2.023*	-3.778***	-2.671***	-2.608***	-2.484***
5	-2.223*	-2.362***	-3.433***	-2.677***	-2.719***	-2.463***
6	-2.195*	2.332***	-3.32***	-2.617***	-2.662***	-2.502***
7	-2.462***	-2.586***	-4.012***	-3.043***	-3.061***	-2.86***
8	-2.518***	-2.58***	-3.613***	-2.929***	-2.924***	-2.74***

Panel C Benchmark: Euro area average

Lag	CEFTA	ECEFTA	BALTICS	FIRST8 CEECs	ALL9 CEECs	FIRST10
1	-1.47	-1.749	-3.476***	-2.222***	-2.324***	-2.44***
2	-1.637	-1.953	-3.397***	-2.297***	-2.435***	-2.49***
3	-1.797	-2.08**	-3.797***	-2.547***	-2.652***	-2.644***
4	-1.776	-1.818	-3.946***	-2.589***	-2.527***	-2.742***
5	-2.022	-2.183**	-3.593***	-2.611***	-2.653***	-2.712***
6	-2.174*	-2.295***	-3.712***	-2.751***	-2.768***	-2.832***
7	-2.289**	-2.417***	-4.486***	-3.113***	-3.107***	-3.209***
8	-2.547***	-2.57***	-4.002***	-3.093***	-3.047***	-3.179***

Notes: *** indicates significance at 1%, ** at 5% and * at 10%.

Table 4: The IPS test: estimates of convergence coefficients and half-lives

Country	ρ (GE)	HL (GE)	ρ (GR)	HL (GR)	ρ (EA)	HL (EA)
CY	0.62	1.45	0.949	13.24	0.64	1.55
CZ	0.967	20.66	0.915	7.8	0.968	21.31
ES	0.962	17.89	0.954	14.72	0.963	18.38
HU	0.991	76.67	0.98	34.31	0.992	86.3
LA	0.949	13.24	0.938	10.83	0.945	12.25
LI	0.981	36.13	0.975	27.38	0.979	32.66
MA	0.755	2.47	0.929	9.41	0.829	3.7
PO	0.977	29.79	0.974	26.31	0.977	29.79
RO	0.962	17.89	0.96	16.98	0.963	18.38
SVK	0.899	6.51	0.926	9.02	0.901	6.65
SVL	0.944	12.03	0.915	7.8	0.946	12.49
Average	**ρ (GE)**	**HL (GE)**	**ρ (GR)**	**HL (GR)**	**ρ (EA)**	**HL (EA)**
CEFTA	0.956	29.13	0.942	17.05	0.957	31.31
ECEFTA	0.957	27.26	0.945	17.04	0.958	29.15
BALTICS	0.964	22.42	0.956	17.64	0.962	21.10
FIRST8	0.959	26.62	0.947	17.27	0.959	27.48
ALL9	0.959	25.65	0.949	17.24	0.959	26.47
FIRST10	0.905	21.68	0.946	16.08	0.914	22.51

Notes: ρ denotes the speed of convergence, while HL represents the half-life. The reported values are calculated for a lag of 8 in the specification of the ADF-type maintained regression. The half-lives are reported in months and years (in brackets) and indicate how many months (years) it takes for a shock to the inflation differential to dissipate by a half. Country codes are given in Table 1.

Table 5: SURADF test results for inflation differentials with respect to Germany

Panel A: CEFTA

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.978	31.13	-1.352	-3.655	-3.074	-2.754
HU	0.993	98.85	-0.895	-3.788	-3.112	-2.813
PO	0.977	30.08	-3.316**	-3.886	-3.238	-2.911
SVK	0.935	10.29	-2.647	-3.633	-3.038	-2.746
SVL	0.959	16.45	-3.007*	-3.751	-3.116	-2.793

Panel B: ECEFTA

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.979	32.45	-1.312	-3.632	-3.084	-2.770
HU	0.993	92.64	-0.942	-3.792	-3.151	-2.839
PO	0.977	29.61	-3.359**	-3.915	-3.288	-2.940
RO	0.971	23.60	-2.389	-3.653	-3.060	-2.753
SVK	0.925	8.90	-2.691	-3.706	-3.104	-2.758
SVL	0.956	15.57	-3.142**	-3.746	-3.123	-2.803

Table 5 continued

Panel C: BALTICS

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
ES	0.960	17.01	-4.280***	-3.589	-2.984	-2.674
LA	0.952	14.17	-5.024***	-3.644	-3.011	-2.692
LI	0.975	27.82	-3.050**	-3.642	-3.031	-2.706

Panel D: FIRST 8 CEECs

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.975	27.34	-1.534	-3.803	-3.167	-2.856
ES	0.958	16.27	-4.579***	-3.763	-3.173	-2.853
HU	0.992	82.65	-1.059	-3.807	-3.201	-2.878
LA	0.905	6.98	-3.875***	-3.823	-3.224	-2.869
LI	0.979	33.14	-2.607	-3.804	-3.178	-2.835
PO	0.969	22.20	-4.543***	-3.908	-3.292	-3.004
SVK	0.935	10.39	-2.267	-3.650	-3.083	-2.800
SVL	0.943	11.80	-3.653**	-3.833	-3.200	-2.862

Panel E: ALL 9 CEECs

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.975	27.67	-1.522	-3.772	-3.168	-2.856
ES	0.958	16.19	-4.604***	-3.758	-3.158	-2.856
HU	0.991	76.99	-1.138	-3.804	-3.213	-2.898
LA	0.906	7.00	-3.869**	-3.897	-3.194	-2.877
LI	0.978	31.46	-2.756	-3.748	-3.138	-2.832
PO	0.969	21.99	-4.603***	-4.068	-3.421	-3.095
RO	0.978	31.27	-1.720	-3.763	-3.177	-2.805
SVK	0.935	10.24	-2.304	-3.758	-3.131	-2.807
SVL	0.942	11.58	-3.737**	-3.889	-3.254	-2.925

Panel F: FIRST 10

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CY	0.760	2.53	-3.927**	-4.478	-3.865	-3.518
CZ	0.974	26.39	-1.595	-4.450	-3.805	-3.516
ES	0.958	16.27	-4.580***	-3.915	-3.301	-2.999
HU	0.990	71.57	-1.245	-4.349	-3.736	-3.406
LA	0.907	7.09	-3.862*	-4.573	-3.929	-3.601
LI	0.978	31.20	-2.786	-4.441	-3.833	-3.505
MA	0.825	3.61	-3.202	-4.468	-3.837	-3.492
PO	0.968	21.52	-4.803***	-4.019	-3.339	-3.029
SVK	0.934	10.20	-2.343	-4.353	-3.700	-3.389
SVL	0.943	11.78	-3.693***	-4.621	-3.953	-3.619

Notes: ρ denotes the speed of convergence, HL the half-life calculated in number of months, t-stat the t-statistic on the lagged value of the inflation differential in the ADF regressions, while CV stands for the critical values. CY=Cyprus, CZ=Czech Republic, ES=Estonia, HU=Hungary, LA=Latvia, LI=Lithuania, MA=Malta, PO=Poland, SVK=Slovakia and SVL=Slovenia.

Table 6: SURADF test results for inflation differentials with respect to Greece

Panel A: CEFTA

Country	ϕ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.978	31.13	-1.352	-3.655	-3.074	-2.754
HU	0.993	98.85	-0.895	-3.788	-3.112	-2.813
PO	0.977	30.08	-3.316**	-3.886	-3.238	-2.911
SVK	0.935	10.29	-2.647	-3.633	-3.038	-2.746
SVL	0.959	16.45	-3.007***	-3.751	-3.116	-2.793

Panel B: ECEFTA

Country	ϕ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.968	21.00	-1.415	-3.775	-3.127	-2.833
HU	0.984	41.83	-1.579	-3.931	-3.347	-3.008
PO	0.975	27.43	-2.991	-4.051	-3.446	-3.108
RO	0.971	23.84	-2.221	-3.627	-3.036	-2.714
SVK	0.948	13.08	-2.257	-3.694	-3.124	-2.816
SVL	0.951	13.93	-2.353	-3.841	-3.250	-2.938

Panel C: The BALTICS

Country	ϕ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
ES	0.953	14.25	-4.157***	-3.691	-3.007	-2.701
LA	0.937	10.64	-4.977***	-3.679	-3.106	-2.828
LI	0.962	17.93	-3.793***	-3.778	-3.198	-2.859

Panel D: First 8 CEECs

Country	ϕ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.964	18.66	-1.611	-3.888	-3.250	-2.919
ES	0.956	15.26	-4.050***	-3.840	-3.173	-2.878
HU	0.981	35.25	-1.855	-3.988	-3.358	-3.023
LA	0.874	5.13	-4.422***	-3.893	-3.281	-2.974
LI	0.977	29.56	-2.394	-3.983	-3.337	-2.983
PO	0.965	19.24	-4.168***	-4.144	-3.193	-2.595
SVK	0.949	13.15	-2.242	-3.878	-3.152	-2.840
SVL	0.936	10.46	-2.854	-4.014	-3.367	-3.022

Table 6 continued

Panel E: ALL 9 CEECs

Country	ϕ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.964	18.72	-1.609	-3.755	-3.257	-2.927
ES	0.955	15.17	-4.075***	-3.870	-3.219	-2.883
HU	0.980	33.68	-1.954	-4.031	-3.394	-3.072
LA	0.875	5.18	-4.388***	-3.947	-3.332	-3.029
LI	0.976	28.96	-2.443	-3.928	-3.343	-3.004
PO	0.964	19.09	-4.265***	-4.198	-3.559	-3.254
RO	0.972	24.49	-2.137	-3.735	-3.094	-2.772
SVK	0.948	13.05	-2.259	-3.799	-3.115	-2.820
SVL	0.933	10.04	-2.978	-4.060	-3.355	-3.007

Panel F: FIRST 10

Country		HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CY	0.938	10.87	-1.988	-3.805	-3.155	-2.823
CZ	0.963	18.28	-1.647	-3.872	-3.310	-2.978
ES	0.955	15.10	-4.095***	-3.815	-3.193	-2.902
HU	0.982	38.52	-1.709	-4.037	-3.428	-3.076
LA	0.878	5.32	-4.348***	-4.009	-3.383	-3.031
LI	0.980	34.27	-2.142	-4.160	-3.406	-3.083
MA	0.938	10.75	-2.537	-3.895	-3.236	-2.904
PO	0.967	20.48	-3.965**	-4.297	-3.631	-3.275
SVK	0.945	12.36	-2.424	-3.861	-3.222	-2.901
SVL	0.938	10.79	-2.778	-3.907	-3.339	-3.032

Notes: ρ denotes the speed of convergence, HL the half life calculated in number of months, t-stat the t-statistic on the lagged value of the inflation differential in the ADF regressions, while CV stands for the critical values. CY=Cyprus, CZ=Czech Republic, ES=Estonia, HU=Hungary, LA=Latvia, LI=Lithuania, MA=Malta, PO=Poland, SVK=Slovakia and SVL=Slovenia.

Table 7: SURADF test results for inflation differentials with respect to Euro area benchmark

Panel A: CEFTA

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.979	32.90	-1.385	-3.655	-3.054	-2.737
HU	0.994	108.67	-0.873	-3.681	-3.090	-2.755
PO	0.979	33.16	-3.121*	-3.807	-3.197	-2.854
SVK	0.933	9.95	-2.444	-3.587	-2.980	-2.696
SVL	0.955	15.06	-3.368**	-3.643	-3.003	-2.706

Panel B: ECEFTA

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.981	35.45	-1.291	-3.674	-3.035	-2.729
HU	0.994	110.50	-0.858	-3.682	-3.044	-2.772
PO	0.979	32.72	-3.164***	-3.836	-3.170	-2.867
RO	0.976	28.38	-2.028	-3.687	-3.089	-2.790
SVK	0.932	9.92	-2.454	-3.686	-3.102	-2.788
SVL	0.956	15.36	-3.330**	-3.739	-3.131	-2.795

Panel C: The BALTICS

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
ES	0.953	14.25	-4.157***	-3.691	-3.007	-2.701
LA	0.937	10.64	-4.977***	-3.679	-3.106	-2.828
LI	0.962	17.93	-3.793***	-3.778	-3.198	-2.859

Panel D: FIRST 8 CEECs

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.978	30.87	-1.461	-3.674	-3.104	-2.787
ES	0.964	18.94	-4.134***	-3.705	-3.118	-2.789
HU	0.994	123.27	-0.774	-3.679	-3.102	-2.764
LA	0.905	6.98	-3.884***	-3.870	-3.181	-2.858
LI	0.978	31.33	-2.635	-3.760	-3.132	-2.840
PO	0.972	24.24	-4.477***	-3.827	-3.244	-2.929
SVK	0.941	11.42	-2.112	-3.706	-3.100	-2.760
SVL	0.947	12.85	-3.541**	-3.711	-3.103	-2.785

Panel E: ALL 9 CEECs

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.979	32.49	-1.394	-3.759	-3.137	-2.796
ES	0.964	19.05	-4.123***	-3.760	-3.114	-2.801
HU	0.995	129.88	-0.735	-3.715	-3.155	-2.809
LA	0.905	6.97	-3.891**	-3.896	-3.215	-2.900
LI	0.977	30.23	-2.743	-3.806	-3.167	-2.826
PO	0.971	23.76	-4.576***	-3.901	-3.272	-2.951
RO	0.979	32.73	-1.691	-3.745	-3.137	-2.812
SVK	0.941	11.41	-2.116	-3.678	-3.094	-2.753
SVL	0.949	13.19	-3.483**	-3.737	-3.143	-2.804

Table 7 continued

Panel F: FIRST 10

Country		HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CY	0.767	2.61	-3.883***	-3.746	-3.135	-2.803
CZ	0.978	30.50	-1.481	-3.741	-3.128	-2.801
ES	0.964	19.03	-4.120***	-3.789	-3.181	-2.848
HU	0.993	104.07	-0.930	-3.724	-3.174	-2.859
LA	0.908	7.18	-3.810**	-3.871	-3.262	-2.931
LI	0.977	30.19	-2.769	-3.911	-3.281	-2.914
MA	0.878	5.31	-2.639	-3.805	-3.164	-2.830
PO	0.971	23.86	-4.617***	-3.911	-3.288	-2.947
SVK	0.940	11.12	-2.194	-3.756	-3.144	-2.833
SVL	0.948	12.95	-3.543**	-3.775	-3.212	-2.855

Notes: ρ denotes the speed of convergence, HL the half life calculated in number of months, t-stat the t-statistic on the lagged value of the inflation differential in the ADF regressions, while CV stands for the critical values. CY=Cyprus, CZ=Czech Republic, ES=Estonia, HU=Hungary, LA=Latvia, LI=Lithuania, MA=Malta, PO=Poland, SVK=Slovakia and SVL=Slovenia.

Table 8: SURADF test results for inflation differentials with respect to group averages

Panel A: CEFTA

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.971	23.81	-2.594	-4.221	-3.690	-3.378
HU	0.973	25.23	-2.523	-4.206	-3.677	-3.352
PO	0.971	23.22	-3.409***	-4.187	-3.646	-3.353
SVK	0.975	26.90	-2.648	-4.422	-3.881	-3.584
SVL	0.965	19.54	-2.750	-4.163	-3.606	-3.324

Panel B: ECEFTA

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.948	13.06	-3.668	-4.142	-3.592	-3.273
HU	0.973	25.46	-2.525	-4.182	-3.576	-3.257
PO	0.969	21.72	-2.858	-4.207	-3.554	-3.264
RO	0.969	21.67	-3.938	-5.097	-4.527	-4.222
SVK	0.974	26.22	-2.293	-4.337	-3.763	-3.450
SVL	0.970	22.77	-2.607	-4.138	-3.575	-3.285

Panel C: The BALTICS

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
ES	0.927	9.13	-3.184***	-3.879	-3.353	-3.070
LA	0.946	12.49	-3.511***	-3.858	-3.332	-3.034
LI	0.944	12.02	-3.610***	-3.866	-3.314	-3.042

Table 8 continued

Panel D: FIRST 8 CEECs

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.957	15.85	-3.809**	-3.877	-3.313	-2.980
ES	0.942	11.57	-3.610**	-4.094	-3.577	-3.216
HU	0.918	8.13	-5.342***	-3.797	-3.284	-2.976
LA	0.944	12.10	-2.836	-3.920	-3.321	-2.971
LI	0.968	21.56	-3.093	-4.108	-3.489	-3.154
PO	0.952	14.03	-3.147***	-3.998	-3.358	-3.028
SVK	0.963	18.42	-3.427***	-4.336	-3.728	-3.390
SVL	0.971	23.82	-2.946	-3.819	-3.268	-2.963

Panel E: ALL 9 CEECs

Country	ρ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CZ	0.944	11.98	-4.247	-4.041	-3.375	-3.063
ES	0.946	12.48	-3.740	-4.067	-3.488	-3.212
HU	0.932	9.86	-4.828	-3.944	-3.360	-3.063
LA	0.963	18.57	-2.486	-4.014	-3.425	-3.094
LI	0.976	28.24	-2.564	-4.046	-3.474	-3.159
PO	0.934	10.12	-3.152	-3.885	-3.284	-2.991
RO	0.961	17.21	-5.345	-5.606	-5.075	-4.727
SVK	0.966	19.82	-3.229	-4.206	-3.585	-3.271
SVL	0.972	23.99	-2.928	-4.005	-3.437	-3.158

Panel F: FIRST 10

Country	ϕ	HL	t-stat	CV		
				1%	5%	10%
CY	0.962	17.67	-2.930	-4.073	-3.446	-3.089
CZ	0.952	14.13	-3.282***	-3.941	-3.289	-2.963
ES	0.953	14.43	-3.446***	-4.221	-3.539	-3.171
HU	0.946	12.45	-3.645**	-3.946	-3.294	-2.966
LA	0.985	45.47	-2..451	-3.944	-3.310	-2.970
LI	0.965	19.65	-3.759**	-4.176	-3.456	-3.117
MA	0.958	16.20	-3.734**	-3.876	-3.253	-2.954
PO	0.963	18.18	-3.200*	-4.144	-3.487	-3.125
SVK	0.965	19.21	-2.601	-4.113	-3.483	-3.158
SVL	0.966	19.94	-3.200***	-3.739	-3.211	-2.866

Notes: ρ denotes the speed of convergence, HL the half life calculated in number of months, t-stat the t-statistic on the lagged value of the inflation differential in the ADF regressions, while CV stands for the critical values. CY=Cyprus, CZ=Czech Republic, ES=Estonia, HU=Hungary, LA=Latvia, LI=Lithuania, MA=Malta, PO=Poland, SVK=Slovakia and SVL=Slovenia.

Table 9: Nonlinear STAR models for inflation convergence

Country	Nonlinear model
Cyprus	ESTAR (4)
Czech Republic	Linear model
Estonia	ESTAR (12)
Hungary	LSTAR (9)
Latvia	LSTAR (1)
Lithuania	ESTAR (6)
Malta	LSTAR (4)
Poland	Linear model
Romania	LSTAR (9)
Slovakia	Linear model
Slovenia	ESTAR (7)

Note: the numbers in brackets correspond to the delay parameter, which characterises the most likely nonlinear convergence model. ESTAR= Exponential Smooth Transition Autoregressive (model). LSTAR= Logistic Smooth Transition Autoregressive (model).

Appendix

Linearity Tests for Inflation Differentials with respect to Germany

Table A.1 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Cyprus

d = 1

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.648	0.737	0.952	0.673	0.969	0.774	0.974	0.646	0.648	0.924	0.954
HR	0.577	0.888	0.978	0.632	0.946	0.616	0.907	0.614	0.577	0.786	0.904
OR	0.507	0.951	0.585	0.946	0.681	0.569	0.987	0.751	0.507	0.866	0.954

d = 2

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.822	0.912	0.962	0.858	0.992	0.941	0.845	0.803	0.822	0.995	0.893
HR	0.786	0.885	0.932	0.848	0.982	0.862	0.852	0.666	0.786	0.607	0.936
OR	0.699	0.878	0.762	0.970	0.683	0.959	0.874	0.510	0.699	0.962	0.799

d = 3

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.987	0.960	0.974	0.866	0.849	0.250	0.793	0.686	0.987	0.624	0.461
HR	0.864	0.891	0.932	0.671	0.864	0.256	0.800	0.507	0.864	0.262	0.395
OR	0.966	0.974	0.796	0.830	0.937	0.154	0.894	0.639	0.966	0.580	0.345

d = 4

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.776	0.576	0.248	0.830	0.047	0.032	0.104	0.325	0.776	0.023	0.032
HR	0.628	0.095	0.377	0.709	0.347	0.122	0.246	0.153	0.628	0.465	0.132
OR	0.640	0.225	0.690	0.063	0.495	0.098	0.261	0.332	0.640	0.061	0.029

d = 5

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.591	0.710	0.725	0.657	0.841	0.775	0.555	0.656	0.591	0.555	0.795
HR	0.274	0.525	0.638	0.257	0.870	0.667	0.299	0.629	0.274	0.589	0.706
OR	0.519	0.840	0.603	0.937	0.758	0.953	0.652	0.772	0.519	0.555	0.865

d = 6

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.438	0.810	0.851	0.422	0.917	0.787	0.668	0.912	0.438	0.663	0.864
HR	0.066	0.191	0.428	0.085	0.350	0.410	0.691	0.706	0.066	0.248	0.638
OR	0.528	0.900	0.490	0.909	0.799	0.441	0.559	0.835	0.528	0.748	0.531

Table A.1 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.881	0.988	0.967	0.923	0.987	0.867	0.586	0.970	0.881	0.980	0.949
HR	0.740	0.943	0.730	0.807	0.923	0.794	0.451	0.775	0.740	0.729	0.879
OR	0.780	0.949	0.827	0.978	0.947	0.841	0.692	0.908	0.780	0.981	0.945

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.648	0.885	0.897	0.730	0.696	0.226	0.661	0.882	0.648	0.571	0.300
HR	0.519	0.710	0.764	0.605	0.595	0.128	0.327	0.703	0.519	0.550	0.230
OR	0.645	0.865	0.726	0.638	0.882	0.126	0.390	0.843	0.645	0.544	0.242

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.318	0.591	0.637	0.391	0.661	0.537	0.553	0.755	0.318	0.320	0.825
HR	0.607	0.642	0.691	0.692	0.564	0.483	0.536	0.736	0.607	0.103	0.937
OR	0.602	0.926	0.681	0.839	0.860	0.371	0.553	0.948	0.602	0.321	0.806

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.516	0.390	0.568	0.407	0.313	0.144	0.697	0.301	0.516	0.291	0.285
HR	0.554	0.609	0.726	0.492	0.514	0.534	0.532	0.389	0.554	0.505	0.501
OR	0.593	0.559	0.518	0.554	0.567	0.370	0.695	0.312	0.593	0.439	0.383

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.130	0.085	0.102	0.179	0.034	0.073	0.328	0.166	0.130	0.007	0.152
HR	0.313	0.641	0.455	0.387	0.652	0.272	0.236	0.424	0.313	0.360	0.718
OR	0.139	0.080	0.185	0.039	0.222	0.025	0.344	0.093	0.139	0.007	0.086

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.068	0.166	0.124	0.072	0.177	0.455	0.221	0.514	0.068	0.167	0.500
HR	0.362	0.818	0.573	0.426	0.704	0.573	0.611	0.818	0.362	0.522	0.950
OR	0.125	0.106	0.158	0.055	0.398	0.320	0.629	0.417	0.125	0.220	0.401

A.2

Table A.2 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Czech Republic

d = 1

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.076	0.268	0.315	0.102	0.069	0.043	0.445	0.698	0.076	0.082	0.054
HR	0.091	0.153	0.391	0.123	0.785	0.717	0.560	0.963	0.091	0.768	0.757
OR	0.426	0.285	0.499	0.526	0.890	0.530	0.541	0.866	0.426	0.026	0.418

d = 2

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.047	0.116	0.202	0.063	0.041	0.041	0.515	0.451	0.047	0.638	0.027
HR	0.069	0.281	0.644	0.095	0.835	0.719	0.781	0.658	0.069	0.670	0.837
OR	0.310	0.529	0.360	0.632	0.595	0.880	0.545	0.389	0.310	0.516	0.825

d = 3

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.052	0.057	0.024	0.068	0.179	0.925	0.093	0.223	0.052	0.771	0.246
HR	0.086	0.251	0.697	0.121	0.947	0.959	0.817	0.331	0.086	0.582	0.981
OR	0.290	0.798	0.357	0.976	0.469	0.832	0.657	0.335	0.290	0.409	0.957

d = 4

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.102	0.138	0.352	0.136	0.379	0.445	0.763	0.336	0.102	0.909	0.364
HR	0.124	0.204	0.587	0.166	0.833	0.877	0.944	0.241	0.124	0.851	0.963
OR	0.436	0.786	0.513	0.884	0.298	0.959	0.993	0.181	0.436	0.818	0.721

d = 5

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.153	0.287	0.706	0.190	0.351	0.115	0.957	0.538	0.153	0.954	0.236
HR	0.152	0.219	0.648	0.204	0.617	0.740	0.917	0.419	0.152	0.601	0.627
OR	0.438	0.771	0.521	0.747	0.283	0.606	0.983	0.244	0.438	0.772	0.336

d = 6

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.244	0.286	0.533	0.301	0.803	0.901	0.775	0.399	0.244	0.749	0.743
HR	0.122	0.342	0.722	0.163	0.877	0.993	0.853	0.369	0.122	0.946	0.825
OR	0.390	0.782	0.472	0.891	0.404	0.735	0.973	0.393	0.390	0.897	0.549

Table A.2 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.819	0.481	0.601	0.818	0.339	0.161	0.630	0.213	0.819	0.892	0.090
HR	0.218	0.545	0.865	0.253	0.754	0.763	0.660	0.569	0.218	0.701	0.694
OR	0.568	0.811	0.633	0.729	0.654	0.582	0.562	0.677	0.568	0.563	0.130

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.868	0.649	0.414	0.864	0.404	0.407	0.214	0.333	0.868	0.739	0.162
HR	0.184	0.552	0.909	0.214	0.919	0.756	0.460	0.798	0.184	0.889	0.888
OR	0.480	0.691	0.510	0.885	0.708	0.229	0.429	0.751	0.480	0.736	0.732

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.838	0.885	0.771	0.836	0.358	0.090	0.399	0.732	0.838	0.421	0.159
HR	0.169	0.503	0.890	0.158	0.986	0.722	0.316	0.880	0.169	0.924	0.955
OR	0.264	0.619	0.280	0.696	0.718	0.034	0.251	0.951	0.264	0.433	0.155

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.880	0.946	0.845	0.839	0.200	0.018	0.404	0.837	0.880	0.219	0.067
HR	0.137	0.533	0.667	0.102	0.951	0.458	0.195	0.910	0.137	0.907	0.887
OR	0.183	0.582	0.162	0.761	0.678	0.157	0.099	0.904	0.183	0.406	0.746

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.904	0.898	0.745	0.906	0.066	0.005	0.338	0.683	0.904	0.062	0.021
HR	0.107	0.255	0.605	0.116	0.809	0.727	0.175	0.688	0.107	0.872	0.831
OR	0.223	0.575	0.259	0.777	0.633	0.514	0.229	0.869	0.223	0.366	0.499

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.882	0.923	0.700	0.899	0.177	0.032	0.243	0.773	0.882	0.292	0.126
HR	0.160	0.212	0.602	0.180	0.623	0.746	0.426	0.511	0.160	0.643	0.755
OR	0.320	0.632	0.366	0.862	0.549	0.488	0.147	0.692	0.320	0.320	0.701

Table A.3 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Estonia

d = 1

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.457	0.418	0.543	0.458	0.316	0.139	0.615	0.358	0.457	0.305	0.369
HR	0.761	0.689	0.515	0.515	0.460	0.787	0.465	0.684	0.761	0.525	0.756
OR	0.089	0.232	0.100	0.020	0.146	0.078	0.260	0.590	0.157	0.260	0.253

d = 2

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.316	0.297	0.397	0.259	0.100	0.034	0.548	0.320	0.316	0.194	0.136
HR	0.737	0.709	0.534	0.460	0.670	0.773	0.584	0.635	0.737	0.592	0.723
OR	0.088	0.026	0.071	0.042	0.125	0.083	0.679	0.605	0.261	0.273	0.251

d = 3

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.407	0.636	0.671	0.348	0.426	0.153	0.534	0.718	0.407	0.550	0.340
HR	0.711	0.825	0.631	0.427	0.815	0.822	0.680	0.842	0.711	0.882	0.949
OR	0.099	0.035	0.051	0.009	0.099	0.224	0.510	0.541	0.312	0.527	0.211

d = 4

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.330	0.470	0.465	0.286	0.002	0.000	0.407	0.563	0.330	0.002	0.001
HR	0.545	0.715	0.792	0.457	0.834	0.113	0.514	0.763	0.545	0.989	0.503
OR	0.070	0.116	0.064	0.148	0.084	0.118	0.346	0.632	0.377	0.889	0.069

d = 5

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.291	0.327	0.195	0.184	0.002	0.000	0.165	0.392	0.291	0.020	0.001
HR	0.630	0.788	0.845	0.614	0.836	0.039	0.283	0.754	0.630	0.888	0.336
OR	0.044	0.028	0.050	0.014	0.017	0.056	0.085	0.768	0.537	0.803	0.352

d = 6

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.268	0.253	0.317	0.215	0.004	0.000	0.471	0.303	0.268	0.042	0.003
HR	0.665	0.808	0.904	0.738	0.760	0.071	0.673	0.598	0.665	0.821	0.362
OR	0.052	0.039	0.075	0.014	0.025	0.016	0.177	0.786	0.738	0.561	0.057

A.5

Table A.3 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.325	0.136	0.146	0.359	0.008	0.005	0.323	0.114	0.325	0.236	0.046
HR	0.748	0.805	0.870	0.860	0.604	0.178	0.153	0.211	0.748	0.674	0.283
OR	0.167	0.316	0.112	0.413	0.146	0.043	0.418	0.041	0.830	0.192	0.078

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.241	0.043	0.021	0.220	0.000	0.000	0.102	0.038	0.241	0.123	0.001
HR	0.677	0.666	0.750	0.797	0.568	0.056	0.319	0.157	0.677	0.591	0.317
OR	0.073	0.085	0.005	0.044	0.022	0.000	0.618	0.068	0.774	0.255	0.124

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.118	0.015	0.016	0.082	0.000	0.000	0.205	0.023	0.118	0.012	0.000
HR	0.541	0.602	0.755	0.742	0.784	0.134	0.531	0.154	0.541	0.511	0.490
OR	0.138	0.509	0.041	0.480	0.177	0.033	0.849	0.099	0.297	0.206	0.914

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.117	0.010	0.017	0.075	0.000	0.001	0.299	0.015	0.117	0.087	0.002
HR	0.470	0.656	0.735	0.661	0.585	0.248	0.354	0.139	0.470	0.704	0.340
OR	0.229	0.521	0.087	0.357	0.376	0.023	0.556	0.108	0.642	0.917	0.908

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.137	0.005	0.003	0.045	0.000	0.002	0.103	0.006	0.137	0.043	0.002
HR	0.471	0.624	0.798	0.625	0.682	0.209	0.371	0.166	0.471	0.648	0.246
OR	0.087	0.148	0.008	0.249	0.046	0.009	0.571	0.146	0.395	0.011	0.576

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.074	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.028	0.001	0.074	0.013	0.000
HR	0.417	0.522	0.410	0.534	0.377	0.075	0.419	0.306	0.417	0.537	0.062
OR	0.063	0.045	0.004	0.018	0.058	0.000	0.596	0.120	0.763	0.025	0.000

Table A.4 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Hungary

d = 1											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.474	0.251	0.307	0.239	0.421	0.615	0.454	0.164	0.474	0.800	0.626
HR	0.407	0.518	0.825	0.455	0.960	0.747	0.739	0.218	0.407	0.694	0.754
OR	0.636	0.882	0.718	0.887	0.598	0.374	0.906	0.176	0.772	0.739	0.471
d = 2											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.691	0.310	0.331	0.304	0.540	0.814	0.401	0.133	0.691	0.849	0.832
HR	0.519	0.518	0.782	0.446	0.955	0.858	0.301	0.243	0.519	0.708	0.816
OR	0.761	0.862	0.726	0.928	0.513	0.706	0.710	0.240	0.886	0.787	0.694
d = 3											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.819	0.264	0.376	0.689	0.610	0.863	0.569	0.076	0.819	0.895	0.881
HR	0.673	0.471	0.625	0.678	0.897	0.835	0.248	0.162	0.673	0.619	0.824
OR	0.826	0.773	0.821	0.873	0.527	0.601	0.589	0.108	0.953	0.756	0.775
d = 4											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.877	0.337	0.397	0.862	0.550	0.705	0.477	0.095	0.877	0.856	0.687
HR	0.781	0.531	0.689	0.844	0.924	0.760	0.244	0.171	0.781	0.407	0.712
OR	0.927	0.734	0.946	0.891	0.511	0.872	0.630	0.190	0.984	0.752	0.895
d = 5											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.943	0.406	0.481	0.963	0.710	0.874	0.522	0.104	0.943	0.943	0.745
HR	0.883	0.601	0.751	0.932	0.949	0.883	0.277	0.252	0.883	0.575	0.757
OR	0.952	0.777	0.973	0.958	0.554	0.812	0.650	0.217	0.990	0.869	0.844
d = 6											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.978	0.579	0.691	0.986	0.794	0.717	0.649	0.172	0.978	0.943	0.653
HR	0.964	0.748	0.776	0.975	0.892	0.726	0.456	0.343	0.964	0.922	0.710
OR	0.960	0.871	0.965	0.972	0.669	0.456	0.870	0.282	0.994	0.837	0.712

Table A.4 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.848	0.480	0.647	0.633	0.695	0.570	0.712	0.188	0.848	0.747	0.721
HR	0.872	0.843	0.804	0.651	0.653	0.537	0.495	0.477	0.872	0.185	0.470
OR	0.929	0.846	0.853	0.639	0.720	0.333	0.868	0.476	0.894	0.384	0.564

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.412	0.220	0.312	0.276	0.179	0.149	0.528	0.165	0.412	0.161	0.424
HR	0.686	0.846	0.783	0.625	0.295	0.165	0.358	0.459	0.686	0.098	0.321
OR	0.297	0.335	0.408	0.048	0.420	0.020	0.552	0.249	0.354	0.007	0.053

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.336	0.127	0.187	0.278	0.035	0.028	0.466	0.101	0.336	0.046	0.115
HR	0.669	0.864	0.569	0.695	0.096	0.048	0.301	0.392	0.669	0.060	0.193
OR	0.454	0.122	0.555	0.002	0.311	0.015	0.541	0.139	0.519	0.003	0.069

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.349	0.044	0.120	0.408	0.006	0.005	0.644	0.025	0.349	0.022	0.011
HR	0.782	0.889	0.572	0.882	0.161	0.028	0.466	0.246	0.782	0.071	0.173
OR	0.713	0.216	0.806	0.005	0.272	0.001	0.793	0.029	0.765	0.002	0.007

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.323	0.005	0.044	0.456	0.011	0.043	0.901	0.002	0.323	0.104	0.022
HR	0.765	0.630	0.550	0.858	0.190	0.030	0.810	0.061	0.765	0.057	0.210
OR	0.815	0.287	0.814	0.022	0.126	0.006	0.904	0.001	0.747	0.030	0.009

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.156	0.001	0.009	0.284	0.003	0.054	0.829	0.001	0.156	0.147	0.006
HR	0.603	0.563	0.664	0.796	0.391	0.030	0.714	0.053	0.603	0.046	0.185
OR	0.684	0.389	0.826	0.033	0.107	0.023	0.761	0.002	0.570	0.045	0.011

Table A.5 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Latvia

d = 1

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.003	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.006	0.579	0.120	0.018	0.003	0.359	0.389
HR	0.203	0.558	0.503	0.260	0.837	0.875	0.444	0.278	0.203	0.504	0.847
OR	0.182	0.000	0.025	0.003	0.050	0.699	0.117	0.019	0.006	0.275	0.434

d = 2

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.003	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.428	0.115	0.016	0.003	0.375	0.240
HR	0.205	0.549	0.403	0.267	0.746	0.628	0.460	0.287	0.205	0.504	0.722
OR	0.137	0.004	0.058	0.000	0.020	0.377	0.115	0.016	0.006	0.203	0.217

d = 3

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.004	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.276	0.122	0.023	0.004	0.126	0.151
HR	0.224	0.486	0.604	0.285	0.682	0.525	0.393	0.225	0.224	0.209	0.827
OR	0.119	0.050	0.041	0.000	0.038	0.464	0.122	0.023	0.007	0.125	0.133

d = 4

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.338	0.097	0.013	0.001	0.240	0.166
HR	0.181	0.530	0.550	0.229	0.780	0.775	0.356	0.186	0.181	0.649	0.939
OR	0.137	0.014	0.176	0.000	0.011	0.711	0.045	0.027	0.006	0.257	0.256

d = 5

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.002	0.175	0.326	0.018	0.001	0.255	0.161
HR	0.172	0.448	0.690	0.225	0.806	0.509	0.308	0.134	0.172	0.614	0.785
OR	0.129	0.090	0.174	0.026	0.014	0.248	0.229	0.041	0.008	0.227	0.161

d = 6

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.142	0.169	0.029	0.001	0.214	0.104
HR	0.182	0.433	0.536	0.221	0.677	0.514	0.237	0.252	0.182	0.481	0.797
OR	0.209	0.135	0.272	0.107	0.022	0.151	0.071	0.047	0.007	0.204	0.190

A.9

Table A.5 Continued

d = 7

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.108	0.142	0.014	0.001	0.169	0.085
HR	0.184	0.412	0.234	0.224	0.504	0.547	0.155	0.218	0.184	0.768	0.715
OR	0.228	0.043	0.291	0.003	0.025	0.240	0.063	0.040	0.008	0.188	0.080

d = 8

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.119	0.151	0.014	0.002	0.179	0.096
HR	0.186	0.405	0.270	0.180	0.461	0.814	0.172	0.271	0.186	0.401	0.668
OR	0.196	0.026	0.192	0.023	0.042	0.300	0.150	0.031	0.007	0.437	0.301

d = 9

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.000	0.023	0.086	0.057	0.002	0.099	0.018
HR	0.213	0.484	0.335	0.253	0.438	0.585	0.097	0.333	0.213	0.618	0.441
OR	0.243	0.007	0.080	0.025	0.042	0.117	0.086	0.096	0.008	0.179	0.010

d = 10

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.003	0.003	0.005	0.002	0.004	0.137	0.189	0.111	0.003	0.380	0.187
HR	0.260	0.477	0.409	0.324	0.555	0.689	0.277	0.402	0.260	0.678	0.746
OR	0.329	0.136	0.124	0.055	0.089	0.058	0.189	0.449	0.008	0.542	0.187

d = 11

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.003	0.003	0.014	0.001	0.005	0.062	0.488	0.093	0.003	0.259	0.156
HR	0.218	0.464	0.776	0.283	0.672	0.526	0.587	0.417	0.218	0.539	0.785
OR	0.340	0.429	0.375	0.101	0.127	0.004	0.488	0.354	0.007	0.329	0.156

d = 12

	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.004	0.003	0.010	0.001	0.007	0.119	0.329	0.099	0.004	0.352	0.196
HR	0.203	0.486	0.730	0.265	0.635	0.679	0.314	0.450	0.203	0.935	0.854
OR	0.387	0.212	0.343	0.115	0.201	0.018	0.329	0.130	0.006	0.619	0.458

A.10

Table A.6 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Lithuania

d = 1											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.441	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.084	0.021
HR	0.099	0.245	0.091	0.145	0.105	0.645	0.023	0.002	0.099	0.914	0.159
OR	0.077	0.110	0.049	0.037	0.089	0.423	0.002	0.007	0.967	0.043	0.013
d = 2											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.205	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.034	0.000
HR	0.102	0.267	0.114	0.170	0.149	0.473	0.032	0.002	0.102	0.644	0.045
OR	0.058	0.106	0.043	0.039	0.075	0.218	0.708	0.006	0.982	0.020	0.006
d = 3											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.044	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004
HR	0.489	0.393	0.344	0.495	0.263	0.101	0.249	0.013	0.489	0.085	0.281
OR	0.106	0.059	0.021	0.016	0.032	0.001	0.073	0.544	0.832	0.120	0.158
d = 4											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.562	0.014	0.001	0.019	0.000	0.001	0.009	0.003	0.562	0.000	0.001
HR	0.778	0.091	0.217	0.301	0.262	0.026	0.011	0.129	0.778	0.015	0.175
OR	0.214	0.025	0.050	0.010	0.044	0.086	0.002	0.047	0.814	0.004	0.099
d = 5											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.112	0.001	0.017	0.000	0.000
HR	0.422	0.042	0.148	0.170	0.190	0.006	0.495	0.033	0.422	0.008	0.179
OR	0.089	0.003	0.002	0.001	0.003	0.000	0.971	0.165	0.436	0.006	0.126
d = 6											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.101	0.001	0.000	0.017	0.000	0.011	0.004	0.001	0.101	0.004	0.009
HR	0.599	0.064	0.213	0.302	0.365	0.037	0.020	0.185	0.599	0.018	0.131
OR	0.088	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.048	0.022	0.090	0.357	0.081	0.074

Table A.6 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.421	0.039	0.000	0.324	0.000	0.117	0.000	0.016	0.421	0.121	0.014
HR	0.326	0.144	0.330	0.480	0.282	0.302	0.117	0.263	0.326	0.066	0.009
OR	0.040	0.046	0.008	0.025	0.028	0.327	0.001	0.281	0.096	0.326	0.042

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.045	0.016	0.014	0.013	0.000	0.001	0.157	0.058	0.045	0.001	0.003
HR	0.152	0.402	0.437	0.286	0.130	0.036	0.122	0.284	0.152	0.015	0.089
OR	0.095	0.199	0.062	0.056	0.139	0.003	0.439	0.071	0.119	0.007	0.020

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.100	0.006	0.009	0.003	0.011	0.242	0.275	0.008	0.100	0.411	0.251
HR	0.159	0.366	0.351	0.257	0.380	0.535	0.507	0.205	0.159	0.226	0.366
OR	0.075	0.292	0.080	0.154	0.159	0.579	0.554	0.089	0.037	0.631	0.155

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.114	0.124	0.020	0.037	0.018	0.182	0.023	0.253	0.114	0.231	0.101
HR	0.311	0.360	0.334	0.396	0.356	0.453	0.108	0.461	0.311	0.028	0.233
OR	0.098	0.263	0.098	0.365	0.226	0.632	0.015	0.326	0.036	0.503	0.126

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.023	0.057	0.000	0.045	0.002	0.711	0.001	0.425	0.023	0.199	0.119
HR	0.283	0.407	0.111	0.472	0.276	0.579	0.014	0.692	0.283	0.572	0.215
OR	0.099	0.445	0.221	0.436	0.261	0.387	0.003	0.511	0.059	0.684	0.466

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.001	0.005	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.330	0.004	0.434	0.001	0.135	0.052
HR	0.246	0.329	0.089	0.529	0.188	0.625	0.076	0.421	0.246	0.782	0.093
OR	0.085	0.364	0.145	0.467	0.215	0.213	0.263	0.865	0.102	0.628	0.197

A.12

Table A.7 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Malta

d = 1

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.387	0.393	0.455	0.504	0.496	0.487	0.496	0.386	0.387	0.668	0.814
HR	0.376	0.131	0.232	0.465	0.282	0.503	0.225	0.250	0.376	0.387	0.766
OR	0.013	0.058	0.015	0.047	0.015	0.414	0.304	0.468	0.058	0.635	0.516

d = 2

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.294	0.329	0.338	0.308	0.285	0.282	0.383	0.391	0.294	0.065	0.663
HR	0.197	0.081	0.275	0.081	0.386	0.333	0.359	0.184	0.197	0.283	0.769
OR	0.003	0.050	0.006	0.171	0.069	0.189	0.367	0.568	0.028	0.072	0.768

d = 3

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.415	0.604	0.743	0.487	0.635	0.316	0.715	0.662	0.415	0.565	0.648
HR	0.347	0.312	0.407	0.316	0.446	0.155	0.470	0.444	0.347	0.354	0.473
OR	0.021	0.281	0.037	0.230	0.228	0.510	0.752	0.346	0.088	0.413	0.744

d = 4

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.216	0.088	0.249	0.086	0.476	0.866	0.814	0.099	0.216	0.189	0.765
HR	0.312	0.184	0.189	0.229	0.380	0.881	0.681	0.078	0.312	0.097	0.866
OR	0.005	0.091	0.005	0.222	0.020	0.974	0.993	0.023	0.057	0.076	0.923

d = 5

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.259	0.266	0.539	0.206	0.583	0.519	0.873	0.333	0.259	0.582	0.675
HR	0.535	0.826	0.837	0.503	0.604	0.343	0.738	0.422	0.535	0.676	0.564
OR	0.011	0.214	0.010	0.190	0.047	0.404	0.987	0.234	0.048	0.511	0.623

d = 6

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.479	0.066	0.010	0.217	0.050	0.870	0.025	0.026	0.479	0.166	0.320
HR	0.753	0.276	0.071	0.671	0.172	0.570	0.031	0.071	0.753	0.419	0.202
OR	0.046	0.002	0.021	0.006	0.012	0.303	0.015	0.021	0.168	0.037	0.071

Table A.7 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.474	0.190	0.354	0.199	0.515	0.713	0.694	0.113	0.474	0.782	0.724
HR	0.842	0.467	0.806	0.760	0.815	0.538	0.593	0.067	0.842	0.736	0.788
OR	0.217	0.265	0.177	0.398	0.077	0.742	0.774	0.099	0.320	0.917	0.795

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.612	0.074	0.261	0.748	0.371	0.604	0.887	0.021	0.612	0.435	0.243
HR	0.684	0.386	0.727	0.794	0.867	0.580	0.836	0.127	0.684	0.700	0.488
OR	0.521	0.189	0.678	0.378	0.055	0.888	0.810	0.020	0.558	0.774	0.343

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.272	0.534	0.500	0.369	0.155	0.045	0.391	0.744	0.272	0.048	0.150
HR	0.597	0.729	0.838	0.781	0.220	0.204	0.416	0.574	0.597	0.789	0.235
OR	0.402	0.660	0.580	0.096	0.561	0.039	0.415	0.571	0.422	0.317	0.179

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.056	0.159	0.058	0.118	0.106	0.529	0.080	0.581	0.056	0.198	0.083
HR	0.250	0.193	0.396	0.396	0.567	0.791	0.280	0.516	0.250	0.316	0.569
OR	0.050	0.040	0.115	0.053	0.054	0.253	0.505	0.100	0.048	0.193	0.031

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.332	0.443	0.147	0.127	0.099	0.181	0.066	0.523	0.332	0.539	0.103
HR	0.647	0.726	0.578	0.629	0.815	0.127	0.409	0.678	0.647	0.477	0.475
OR	0.431	0.268	0.211	0.159	0.276	0.148	0.436	0.265	0.424	0.732	0.268

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.047	0.060	0.180	0.099	0.163	0.285	0.755	0.256	0.047	0.560	0.428
HR	0.108	0.362	0.770	0.131	0.568	0.401	0.667	0.330	0.108	0.442	0.686
OR	0.025	0.064	0.039	0.087	0.012	0.523	0.412	0.058	0.035	0.434	0.313

Table A.8 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Poland

d = 1											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.199	0.174	0.015	0.273	0.000	0.001	0.011	0.244	0.199	0.104	0.004
HR	0.179	0.252	0.611	0.268	0.703	0.055	0.443	0.556	0.179	0.066	0.458
OR	0.399	0.940	0.527	0.987	0.687	0.128	0.771	0.461	0.399	0.148	0.397
d = 2											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.085	0.093	0.009	0.130	0.000	0.002	0.014	0.249	0.085	0.183	0.006
HR	0.178	0.383	0.475	0.266	0.549	0.025	0.264	0.709	0.178	0.083	0.222
OR	0.486	0.889	0.617	0.888	0.707	0.036	0.415	0.621	0.486	0.255	0.138
d = 3											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.056	0.022	0.000	0.093	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.071	0.056	0.257	0.000
HR	0.132	0.317	0.346	0.207	0.532	0.038	0.062	0.611	0.132	0.083	0.135
OR	0.457	0.875	0.547	0.912	0.822	0.014	0.338	0.411	0.457	0.160	0.051
d = 4											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.244	0.529	0.397	0.351	0.039	0.007	0.248	0.787	0.244	0.291	0.048
HR	0.261	0.500	0.783	0.373	0.570	0.119	0.821	0.942	0.261	0.397	0.513
OR	0.487	0.901	0.598	0.955	0.722	0.314	0.438	0.475	0.487	0.443	0.658
d = 5											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.455	0.351	0.051	0.587	0.005	0.011	0.019	0.273	0.455	0.084	0.040
HR	0.318	0.108	0.239	0.434	0.454	0.251	0.133	0.311	0.318	0.082	0.557
OR	0.505	0.781	0.628	0.832	0.550	0.214	0.046	0.598	0.505	0.417	0.342
d = 6											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.226	0.427	0.300	0.330	0.131	0.091	0.220	0.654	0.226	0.155	0.180
HR	0.358	0.180	0.314	0.581	0.612	0.288	0.383	0.481	0.358	0.020	0.338
OR	0.280	0.542	0.433	0.769	0.480	0.713	0.772	0.468	0.280	0.066	0.474

Table A.8 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.413	0.857	0.730	0.624	0.746	0.533	0.342	0.983	0.413	0.756	0.672
HR	0.536	0.615	0.601	0.683	0.630	0.650	0.486	0.842	0.536	0.320	0.691
OR	0.538	0.828	0.690	0.870	0.843	0.840	0.808	0.493	0.538	0.308	0.645

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.554	0.812	0.138	0.737	0.006	0.004	0.013	0.835	0.554	0.093	0.005
HR	0.617	0.297	0.254	0.747	0.455	0.201	0.265	0.550	0.617	0.082	0.252
OR	0.753	0.758	0.806	0.813	0.848	0.532	0.545	0.738	0.753	0.202	0.171

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.152	0.606	0.156	0.278	0.000	0.000	0.037	0.988	0.152	0.001	0.000
HR	0.316	0.439	0.150	0.460	0.290	0.265	0.173	0.946	0.316	0.348	0.146
OR	0.554	0.697	0.714	0.354	0.829	0.315	0.544	0.591	0.554	0.247	0.382

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.210	0.552	0.031	0.200	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.871	0.210	0.123	0.001
HR	0.504	0.568	0.335	0.426	0.295	0.299	0.055	0.841	0.504	0.695	0.097
OR	0.607	0.542	0.692	0.691	0.874	0.833	0.215	0.708	0.607	0.548	0.266

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.576	0.326	0.021	0.210	0.001	0.005	0.006	0.188	0.576	0.312	0.015
HR	0.854	0.382	0.393	0.527	0.552	0.165	0.221	0.425	0.854	0.462	0.195
OR	0.807	0.214	0.716	0.346	0.832	0.278	0.036	0.710	0.807	0.121	0.313

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.437	0.732	0.113	0.474	0.006	0.005	0.013	0.827	0.437	0.437	0.011
HR	0.775	0.876	0.236	0.735	0.374	0.174	0.130	0.894	0.775	0.293	0.074
OR	0.694	0.197	0.717	0.150	0.897	0.180	0.422	0.945	0.694	0.359	0.055

Table A.9 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Romania

d = 1

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.048	0.021	0.000	0.009	0.085	0.164
HR	0.118	0.438	0.853	0.163	0.985	0.554	0.450	0.498	0.118	0.442	0.978
OR	0.154	0.838	0.207	0.594	0.707	0.318	0.027	0.044	0.000	0.023	0.335

d = 2

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.995	0.029	0.000	0.000	0.243	0.989
HR	0.103	0.423	0.870	0.139	0.992	0.968	0.547	0.541	0.103	0.356	0.913
OR	0.213	0.553	0.273	0.225	0.661	0.553	0.243	0.008	0.000	0.037	0.636

d = 3

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.007	0.001	0.441	0.000	0.021	0.000
HR	0.092	0.436	0.861	0.100	0.981	0.497	0.522	0.463	0.092	0.512	0.860
OR	0.131	0.248	0.175	0.104	0.327	0.135	0.284	0.055	0.001	0.104	0.156

d = 4

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.000	0.016	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.919	0.000	0.003	0.000
HR	0.223	0.607	0.779	0.264	0.974	0.368	0.513	0.633	0.223	0.754	0.987
OR	0.103	0.416	0.139	0.277	0.408	0.088	0.034	0.249	0.011	0.678	0.689

d = 5

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.003	0.040	0.056	0.005	0.007	0.025	0.306	0.692	0.003	0.086	0.038
HR	0.325	0.758	0.803	0.329	0.968	0.826	0.563	0.181	0.325	0.802	0.950
OR	0.119	0.744	0.153	0.383	0.446	0.579	0.278	0.038	0.004	0.670	0.952

d = 6

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.008	0.029	0.180	0.012	0.195	0.363	0.861	0.377	0.008	0.761	0.670
HR	0.387	0.791	0.938	0.437	0.990	0.855	0.746	0.102	0.387	0.418	0.980
OR	0.120	0.436	0.154	0.130	0.431	0.397	0.307	0.010	0.002	0.199	0.538

A.17

Table A.9 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.003	0.014	0.013	0.004	0.080	0.764	0.171	0.362	0.003	0.613	0.507
HR	0.307	0.788	0.945	0.381	0.964	0.850	0.309	0.169	0.307	0.713	0.954
OR	0.105	0.318	0.147	0.057	0.401	0.098	0.097	0.036	0.001	0.102	0.261

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.002	0.019	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.168	0.008	0.528	0.002	0.051	0.042
HR	0.290	0.801	0.925	0.353	0.944	0.574	0.292	0.257	0.290	0.821	0.944
OR	0.094	0.357	0.132	0.025	0.361	0.632	0.008	0.001	0.024	0.036	0.367

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.094	0.063	0.000	0.004	0.006
HR	0.190	0.595	0.908	0.219	0.976	0.755	0.154	0.198	0.190	0.860	0.775
OR	0.103	0.411	0.131	0.008	0.361	0.089	0.000	0.002	0.028	0.074	0.077

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.003	0.033	0.012	0.005	0.013	0.189	0.074	0.598	0.003	0.341	0.099
HR	0.242	0.718	0.934	0.308	0.980	0.576	0.439	0.449	0.242	0.776	0.774
OR	0.161	0.680	0.207	0.132	0.570	0.050	0.772	0.011	0.009	0.623	0.183

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.002	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.562	0.010	0.046	0.002	0.226	0.069
HR	0.288	0.814	0.971	0.359	0.922	0.907	0.586	0.485	0.288	0.778	0.684
OR	0.256	0.648	0.315	0.094	0.624	0.155	0.083	0.058	0.008	0.103	0.018

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.005	0.004	0.015	0.004	0.001	0.013	0.387	0.097	0.005	0.048	0.019
HR	0.341	0.859	0.961	0.419	0.925	0.516	0.695	0.600	0.341	0.591	0.534
OR	0.325	0.216	0.394	0.050	0.651	0.020	0.476	0.078	0.005	0.362	0.007

Table A.10 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Slovakia

d = 1											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.012	0.087	0.275	0.018	0.606	0.904	0.772	0.672	0.012	0.957	0.850
HR	0.658	0.853	0.823	0.733	0.611	0.256	0.592	0.669	0.658	0.407	0.815
OR	0.693	0.831	0.633	0.603	0.578	0.106	0.940	0.157	0.693	0.054	0.397
d = 2											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.015	0.092	0.277	0.023	0.630	0.926	0.758	0.638	0.015	0.978	0.811
HR	0.723	0.913	0.872	0.772	0.836	0.498	0.162	0.740	0.723	0.308	0.751
OR	0.822	0.414	0.870	0.521	0.717	0.199	0.058	0.155	0.822	0.027	0.199
d = 3											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.014	0.065	0.217	0.022	0.610	0.959	0.736	0.513	0.014	0.980	0.805
HR	0.643	0.902	0.614	0.662	0.764	0.911	0.241	0.517	0.643	0.694	0.776
OR	0.802	0.249	0.852	0.352	0.716	0.595	0.079	0.051	0.802	0.065	0.101
d = 4											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.015	0.089	0.203	0.020	0.413	0.755	0.603	0.621	0.015	0.871	0.629
HR	0.611	0.916	0.971	0.662	0.902	0.515	0.551	0.552	0.611	0.146	0.656
OR	0.688	0.836	0.760	0.264	0.691	0.197	0.843	0.135	0.688	0.041	0.151
d = 5											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.018	0.085	0.219	0.025	0.462	0.801	0.658	0.559	0.018	0.757	0.642
HR	0.446	0.832	0.889	0.528	0.829	0.328	0.388	0.634	0.446	0.669	0.834
OR	0.336	0.772	0.414	0.498	0.665	0.001	0.825	0.186	0.336	0.122	0.081
d = 6											
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**E**	**H4**	**H3**	**H2**	**H1**	**HL**	**HE**
S	0.023	0.034	0.109	0.024	0.580	0.998	0.605	0.237	0.023	0.936	0.761
HR	0.342	0.760	0.820	0.401	0.807	0.938	0.349	0.289	0.342	0.793	0.978
OR	0.382	0.822	0.458	0.828	0.653	0.029	0.191	0.056	0.382	0.325	0.168

Table A.10 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.025	0.029	0.108	0.039	0.436	0.952	0.649	0.189	0.025	0.819	0.743
HR	0.387	0.788	0.908	0.344	0.797	0.843	0.539	0.458	0.387	0.868	0.983
OR	0.302	0.534	0.378	0.378	0.370	0.134	0.329	0.004	0.302	0.060	0.184

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.264	0.211	0.368	0.334	0.568	0.739	0.634	0.264	0.264	0.704	0.671
HR	0.422	0.831	0.964	0.446	0.823	0.578	0.489	0.751	0.422	0.254	0.938
OR	0.396	0.407	0.434	0.231	0.220	0.004	0.269	0.017	0.396	0.036	0.168

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.186	0.232	0.452	0.242	0.462	0.451	0.738	0.384	0.186	0.573	0.471
HR	0.291	0.723	0.921	0.293	0.786	0.466	0.593	0.502	0.291	0.382	0.988
OR	0.078	0.230	0.101	0.279	0.129	0.034	0.362	0.031	0.078	0.285	0.733

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.139	0.235	0.506	0.179	0.452	0.374	0.812	0.468	0.139	0.504	0.502
HR	0.424	0.814	0.805	0.389	0.835	0.717	0.661	0.509	0.424	0.679	0.964
OR	0.059	0.352	0.086	0.493	0.083	0.285	0.797	0.021	0.059	0.839	0.807

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.209	0.309	0.510	0.206	0.528	0.485	0.709	0.481	0.209	0.655	0.634
HR	0.459	0.731	0.892	0.380	0.828	0.774	0.858	0.319	0.459	0.455	0.892
OR	0.080	0.144	0.112	0.242	0.057	0.743	0.621	0.010	0.080	0.361	0.448

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.317	0.618	0.863	0.272	0.801	0.465	0.903	0.785	0.317	0.728	0.795
HR	0.527	0.785	0.987	0.389	0.839	0.560	0.972	0.530	0.527	0.747	0.893
OR	0.102	0.808	0.142	0.434	0.512	0.173	0.607	0.152	0.102	0.663	0.563

A.20

Table A.11 Results of Standard (S), Heteroskedasticity Robust (HR) and Outlier Robust (OR) LM-type Diagnostic Tests for Linearity of Inflation Differentials: the case of Slovenia

d = 1

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.107	0.137	0.107	0.063	0.056	0.135	0.224	0.325	0.107	0.131	0.084
HR	0.205	0.507	0.767	0.180	0.822	0.700	0.473	0.342	0.205	0.568	0.816
OR	0.358	0.426	0.111	0.015	0.334	0.150	0.217	0.340	0.064	0.439	0.332

d = 2

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.078	0.144	0.266	0.067	0.360	0.543	0.583	0.415	0.078	0.562	0.649
HR	0.126	0.511	0.612	0.160	0.740	0.700	0.697	0.368	0.126	0.543	0.785
OR	0.512	0.913	0.308	0.157	0.535	0.500	0.866	0.282	0.052	0.603	0.658

d = 3

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.102	0.112	0.155	0.072	0.262	0.572	0.401	0.273	0.102	0.618	0.539
HR	0.215	0.519	0.560	0.263	0.717	0.840	0.243	0.324	0.215	0.900	0.835
OR	0.687	0.627	0.363	0.413	0.263	0.612	0.232	0.272	0.104	0.236	0.265

d = 4

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.116	0.283	0.072	0.062	0.170	0.615	0.057	0.611	0.116	0.591	0.217
HR	0.237	0.523	0.189	0.263	0.484	0.740	0.062	0.265	0.237	0.892	0.507
OR	0.670	0.049	0.242	0.143	0.024	0.548	0.003	0.426	0.093	0.606	0.037

d = 5

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.112	0.253	0.062	0.048	0.083	0.346	0.054	0.564	0.112	0.181	0.144
HR	0.332	0.510	0.336	0.317	0.662	0.339	0.160	0.360	0.332	0.753	0.771
OR	0.543	0.037	0.107	0.004	0.007	0.172	0.039	0.334	0.106	0.327	0.029

d = 6

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.165	0.316	0.166	0.103	0.343	0.710	0.156	0.565	0.165	0.457	0.595
HR	0.379	0.741	0.760	0.411	0.921	0.748	0.487	0.640	0.379	0.681	0.906
OR	0.646	0.140	0.417	0.108	0.098	0.100	0.111	0.613	0.150	0.559	0.099

Table A.11 Continued

d = 7

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.074	0.103	0.146	0.066	0.101	0.201	0.400	0.312	0.074	0.262	0.404
HR	0.250	0.578	0.621	0.313	0.827	0.418	0.804	0.442	0.250	0.572	0.379
OR	0.071	0.022	0.077	0.161	0.061	0.004	0.695	0.416	0.057	0.094	0.045

d = 8

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.089	0.046	0.130	0.101	0.129	0.300	0.593	0.120	0.089	0.337	0.489
HR	0.274	0.604	0.672	0.340	0.854	0.369	0.281	0.424	0.274	0.447	0.833
OR	0.058	0.065	0.083	0.258	0.057	0.034	0.476	0.127	0.070	0.491	0.038

d = 9

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.097	0.058	0.137	0.129	0.138	0.311	0.549	0.142	0.097	0.277	0.511
HR	0.293	0.695	0.777	0.368	0.772	0.386	0.255	0.573	0.293	0.306	0.619
OR	0.075	0.043	0.091	0.013	0.098	0.125	0.480	0.187	0.072	0.250	0.339

d = 10

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.065	0.020	0.116	0.094	0.349	0.842	0.781	0.062	0.065	0.694	0.957
HR	0.225	0.407	0.762	0.282	0.706	0.601	0.760	0.296	0.225	0.815	0.945
OR	0.021	0.518	0.021	0.504	0.159	0.519	0.807	0.069	0.053	0.140	0.765

d = 11

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.105	0.017	0.072	0.146	0.222	0.750	0.625	0.034	0.105	0.594	0.788
HR	0.261	0.610	0.702	0.305	0.871	0.655	0.709	0.285	0.261	0.919	0.899
OR	0.024	0.416	0.035	0.159	0.237	0.374	0.634	0.031	0.090	0.469	0.736

d = 12

	L1	L2	L3	L4	E	H4	H3	H2	H1	HL	HE
S	0.122	0.044	0.336	0.161	0.168	0.142	0.974	0.086	0.122	0.341	0.566
HR	0.266	0.686	0.894	0.298	0.864	0.218	0.949	0.330	0.266	0.818	0.660
OR	0.067	0.365	0.096	0.041	0.413	0.094	0.964	0.051	0.112	0.130	0.563

Notes to Appendix

Tables A.1 to A.11 reports the p-values associated to the F version of a battery of LM-type tests for linearity, as follows: L_1 is a linearity test against the alternative of a nonlinear LSTAR specification, developed by Luukkonen, Saikkonen and Teräsvirta (1988). The L2 test statistic evaluates the null of linearity against a nonlinear ESTAR specification and was proposed by Saikkonen and Luukkonen (1988) and Granger and Teräsvirta (1993). L3 denotes the test statistic associated to the general test for linearity against STAR-type specifications, suggested by Luukkonen, Saikkonen and Teräsvirta (op. cit.). E is an economy version of L3. H4 tests the null of linearity in the confines of the approach put forward by Escribano and Jorda (1998) and is supported by the maintained regression. HL and HE are specification tests conducted in the framework proposed by Escribano and Jorda (2001), as follows: HL tests linearity against LSTAR, while in HE, the alternative to a linear model is an ESTAR specification. H1, H2 and H3 represent specification tests that form the decision rule developed by Teräsvirta (1994).
Column 'S' reports the standard version of the linearity tests outlined above, whereas HR and OR correspond to the heteroskedasticity robust and the outlier robust versions, respectively. In the interpretation of the results of the linearity tests, we allow for a 10% level of significance.