MARKET INTEGRATION OF WHEAT IN PAKISTAN

*Jam Gulam Murtaza Sahito**

*Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, Sindh University of Agriculture, Tando Jam, Sindh, Pakistan.

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Sindh Agricultural University, Tandojam, Pakistan during the year 2016. This study is a first attempt of its kind to analyze the extent of market integration in the whole country using an advanced dynamic model, which takes into account the unobserved transaction costs via thresholds. It is based on secondary data, monthly wholesale price data collected from five regional markets from January 1988 to April 2011. Price series were tested for stationarity with the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test and it was found that all prices are integrated of order one. Co-integration was also identified using Johansen's co-integration test. Firstly, Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) was applied to the data to analyze the extent of market integration. The Threshold Vector Error Correction Model (TVECM) with a band of non-adjustment was then applied to incorporate transaction costs, without relying on observations for these costs. It was found that linear VECMs provide misleading results as compared to TVECMs. Short-run adjustments in the TVECM model provide further insight depending on regimes as well as on the markets. In most cases, higher and significant adjustments were found in the upper regime. Lahore market showed the highest adjustment of 68 percent, whereas Hyderabad market adjusted for 34 percent in the upper regime. Multan market adjusted significantly to the shock in Lahore market with 65 and 36 percent in lower and upper regimes, respectively.

KEYWORDS: *Triticum aestivum;* wheat; market integration; co-integration; error-correction; thresholds; Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

Market integration describes the degree of price transmission within vertically or geographically separated markets. Spatial or vertical market integration of homogenous commodities especially in developing countries has been the center of interest for economists in the last few decades. Special attention has typically been given to basic food crops such as wheat and rice, because food insecurity is a major issue for developing countries. Market integration studies in agriculture, especially for developing countries are the tools to examine, evaluate, regulate and reform price polices for food security and price stability.

In the context of Pakistan, a developing country, wheat is the major food crop, providing the largest source of calorie intake, thus it is important from food security perspective. The World Trade Organization (WTO) considers Pakistan as the most food insecure among net wheat importing developing countries (3). Pakistan has not yet achieved self-sufficiency, especially in wheat production, and has remained largely a net importer of wheat. In fact, Pakistan has only exported a small amount of wheat as a result of bumper crop between the years from 2000 to 2006. Overall, the production of wheat has been volatile in Pakistan during the last two decades (3).

Price transmission among domestic markets will enable us to understand the vulnerability of the population to food market shocks in Pakistan. Market integration studies provide valuable information about the efficiency of market functioning and about the dynamics of price

adjustment in the markets. Information of spatial market integration infer the efficiency of pricing, effectiveness of arbitrage and competitiveness of markets, which implies the efficient market functioning (27).

There are many hindrances to the efficient functioning of the agricultural commodities market in Pakistan. Some major issues include insufficient transportation infrastructure, restrictions on the movement of wheat within provinces and districts, no or sparse access to market information, market structure and changes in the costs of production (1, 2). For example, intra-province movement restriction of wheat in the months of harvesting and support price policy of wheat are direct interventions of the government. Transportation infrastructure, information and communication are other factors affecting market integration (1).

The Government of Pakistan has been involved in interventions within the wheat sector via support prices, procurement, storage, transportation and distribution of wheat to flour millers since independence. Two major objectives of this intervention are, first, to protect consumers from higher import prices, and second, to protect producers via procurement and support prices in an effort to reduce price volatility (1). The Government of Pakistan procures about 25 to 30 percent of total wheat production every year (3). These government interventions are considered as the fiscal burden on the economy in case of higher degree of market integration (12, 25). Higher degree of market integration and quicker adjustment of prices to form a new equilibrium as a result of shocks to the market prices also explains the efficient functioning of markets.

Barrett (7) and Barrett and Li (6) are of the opinion that one cannot describe spatial market relationships only by prices but by their combination with transaction costs. However, transaction costs are neither easily available nor can any other proxy be used to incorporate these costs. Threshold models estimate a neutral band linked with unobservable transaction costs and stretch explicit attention to these costs. Therefore,

a threshold vector error correction model (TVECM) is used for analysis, by using a band of non-adjustment (Thresholds) to consider a band of no arbitrage. These models recognize the size of the band or their thresholds in response to shocks to horizontally separated markets prices. This is, however, conditional on, if the shock is substantial enough to raise price differentials between two separated markets above the transaction cost.

To the best of my knowledge, there have been no such studies analyzing market integration of wheat within different regions (Provinces) of Pakistan using advanced dynamic models. Therefore, a thorough market integration analysis of wheat in Pakistan based on information of degree of market integration will assist the government in formulating policies to provide infrastructure and information services in an effort to avoid market exploitation. Keeping in mind the importance of market integration for an efficient marketing system, this paper aims to analyze the degree of market integration with the help of a dynamic model.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
This study was conducted in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Sindh Agricultural University, Tandojam, Pakistan. The study is based on secondary data, monthly wholesale price data of five wholesale wheat markets during the year 2014-15 selected for the study i.e. Hyderabad from Sindh Province, Lahore, Multan, and Rawalpindi from Punjab province and Peshawar form Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. A map of Pakistan, indicating the markets selected for the study is provided in Fig. 1. Monthly wholesale price series of the selected markets, from January 1988 to April 2011 (280 observations), were selected due to unavailability of the data afterwards. The unit of the price is rupees per 40 kg.

Three markets were chosen from Punjab province because Punjab is the largest producer of wheat in Pakistan. Punjab contributes about 75 percent of total production of wheat in Pakistan. No market from Baluchistan was included as time series data are not available and very low production.

As Punjab is the largest contributor to overall production of the country as well as the largest province in terms of population, it is also the biggest province in terms of consumption (9). The above-mentioned data are available in Agricultural Statistics of Pakistan 2010-11 issued by Pakistan Bureau of Statistics.

In the context of standard regression, stationarity of the time-series variables naturally becomes an issue (10). Thus, the Augmented Dickey Fuller unit root test, commonly known as ADF test developed by Dickey and Fuller (10, 11) to investigate the presence of unit roots (non-stationarity) in the individual time series of prices, has been performed. If two non-stationary time series variables are integrated of the same order I(d), then a linear combination of those two non-stationary variables might be stationary. This implies that the variables are co-integrated (13). A co-integrated process exhibits non-stationarity with both long-run equilibrium and short-run relationships. This is a solution to spurious regressions (13). Two major co-integration methods, extensively and consistently used in the econometric literature, are (i) the Engle and Granger's two-step method and (ii) the Johansen maximum likelihood method (13, 19). To test the pair-wise as well as joint co-integration between different prices series, the Johansen (19) method of maximum likelihood was used in this study, mainly because of shortcomings of Engle-Granger approach. Except that it relies on a two-step method, the order of the variables in the regression in first step is also an important issue (4). Further, we cannot test for multiple co-integrating vectors with this approach like with the Johansen method. Another advantage of using the Johansen method is that one can test hypotheses on the co-integration relationship itself (9).


Fig. 1. Wheat production and shortfall province-wise for the year 2007-08

In market integration models, except a few studies on Parity Bound Models (PBM) presented by Baulch (8) and Barrett and Li (6), most of the empirical studies applied Vector Error Correction models, because of their easy and intuitive interpretation. In Parity Bound Models (PBM) (6, 8), there are three possible trade regimes: at the parity bound, inside the parity bond and outside the parity bond attributed as regimes I, II and III. In these regimes, the price differential between two locations is exactly equal to transaction costs, the difference of prices between two locations is lower than transaction costs and the price difference is higher than the transaction costs, respectively.

PBM has been subjected to criticism due to a few limitations. First, as only contemporaneous spreads are used in its estimation, it is difficult for the model to consider the lagged price adjustment. Secondry, transfer costs are included explicitly in the notion of spatial equilibrium, if transfer costs data are not available the PBM requires an assumption about the evolution of transfer costs over time (15, 23). It is crucial that transfer costs should be estimated as precisely as possible because the estimates of regime probabilities in the model are only as good as the estimate of mean transfer costs used to separate regimes (15, 18). In principal, VECM is a re-parameterization of Vector Autoregressive (VAR) models (15). Fundamentally, VECM uses lagged values of the time series in relation to current price change. A bivariate VECM Model can be defined as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t} \\ \Delta P_{2t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_i^{P_1,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_1,P_2} \\ \beta_i^{P_2,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_2,P_2} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t-1} \\ \Delta P_{2t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} [ECT_{t-1}] + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{1t} \\ \varepsilon_{2t} \end{bmatrix} \qquad \text{(i)}$$

Here: $\Delta P_t = P_t - P_{t-1}$, P_1 is the price series in one market and P_2 is the price series in the other.

VECM is different from VAR in the sense that it separates the long-run relationship (co-integration coefficients) from short-run adjustments that describe the correction of price to disequilibrium.

In this model, φ_i coefficients describe the long-run reaction of prices to disequilibrium, while, β_i are adjustment parameters for lagged short-run dynamics (22). If the two price series are co-integrated than φ_1 must be negative.

Hassouneh (18) describe two restrictions of VECM. First, parameters of VECM are linear, as these are assumed the same over the whole period under study. Secondary, a linearity restriction is described based on the linear reaction of dependent variables subject to changes in the independent variables. Many studies have emphasized the deviations from one or both forms of linearity in different applications of market integration (15, 18, 23).

Parameters of price transmission between two spatially separated markets having variable transportation costs cannot be fixed over time. In this case, the first type of linearity is a very hard restriction. Barrett and Li (6) describe the difficulties in observing all possible transaction costs, like: trade flows, risk assessment, discount rates and other possible costs. They also implied the possibility of trade and adjustment of short-run prices due to arbitrage, if the difference between two market prices is higher than the transaction cost, because of the unobservable costs, policy interventions and different strategies. Hence, if the price difference is less than a certain threshold, there is no arbitrage benefit for traders.

Balke and Fomby (5) introduced the concept of threshold co-integration, based on discontinuous long-run equilibrium adjustments. This concept allows addressing the above-mentioned criticism on linear co-integration and justifies the use of threshold models for price adjustment. In particular, this model allows for a no-arbitrage band. Adjustments only occur, when the deviations in the long-run equilibrium are greater than transaction costs or a particular threshold, where the error-correction term determines the threshold parameter. As the TVECM is a special form of asymmetric VECMs, price adjustment can be different depending on the regimes. This model is extendable, by incorporating constants or intercepts and lags in each regime. Regime-switching models have attracted several researchers of price transmission analysis, and have been extended and applied by many researchers (14, 17, 21, 22).

A bivariate TVECM Model with two thresholds (three regimes) can be defined as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t} \\ \Delta P_{2t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_i^{P_1,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_1,P_2} \\ \beta_i^{P_2,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_2,P_2} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t-1} \\ \Delta P_{2t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} [ECT_{t-1}] + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{1t} \\ \varepsilon_{2t} \end{bmatrix}, if\ ECT_{t-1} \leq \gamma_1$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t} \\ \Delta P_{2t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_i^{P_1,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_1,P_2} \\ \beta_i^{P_2,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_2,P_2} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t-1} \\ \Delta P_{2t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} [ECT_{t-1}] + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{1t} \\ \varepsilon_{2t} \end{bmatrix}, if\ \gamma_1 \leq ECT_{t-1} \leq \gamma_2$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t} \\ \Delta P_{2t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_i^{P_1,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_1,P_2} \\ \beta_i^{P_2,P_1} & \beta_i^{P_2,P_2} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \Delta P_{1t-1} \\ \Delta P_{2t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 \end{bmatrix} [ECT_{t-1}] + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{1t} \\ \varepsilon_{2t} \end{bmatrix}, if\ ECT_{t-1} \geq \gamma_2 \cdots \textbf{(ii)}$$

Here, γ_1 and γ_2 are the threshold parameters. P_1 and P_2 represent the prices in two markets respectively. The autoregressive parameters differ, based on regimes, whether the variables are below, between two regimes or above the higher threshold. These models have three regimes, namely, lower, middle and higher. Each regime should contain at least 5 to 15 percent of all observations for the empirical application following Goodwin and Piggott (14), Hansen and Seo (17) and Meyer (22). Estimation of this model takes place with a two-dimensional grid search over the thresholds and co-integrating values based on maximum likelihood estimator using "tsDyn" package in R developed by Stigler (28).

To test for threshold effects, the Sup*LM* (Supremum Lagrange Multiplier) test developed by Hansen and Seo (17) was used, setting the null hypothesis of linear co-integration against the alternative hypothesis of threshold co-integration. This test uses the co-integration coefficient parameter from the linear VECM representation and applies a grid search over the threshold parameter. Critical values and the p-values are generated by a fixed regressor bootstrap method. The advantage of this method is that LM-like statistics allow for heteroscedasticity of unknown form in the same way as White's consistent heteroskedastic standard errors, hence it achieves the correct first-order asymptotic distribution. The Sup LM test statistic can be denoted as:

$$SupLM = sup_{\gamma L\ \leq \gamma \leq \gamma U} LM(\tilde{\beta}, \gamma) \cdots \textbf{(iii)}$$

Here $\tilde{\beta}$, co-integration value is β estimated and γ is the threshold parameter. γL is the trimming parameter (π_0) of the constraint set for the number of observations below the threshold parameter and γU is $(1 - \pi_0)$ number of observations above the threshold. The restriction for the number of observations in the regimes (trimming parameter) must satisfy the following expression.

$$\pi_0 \leq P(ECT_{t-1} \leq \gamma) \leq 1 - \pi_0 \cdots \textbf{(iv)}$$

In this analysis, π_0 is equal to 0.10, as Andrew (1993) recommends that the value of π_0 should range from 0.05 to 0.15. Further, 5000 bootstrap replications are used in the analysis to calculate asymptotic critical values and the p-values for the test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
This section reveals the estimated results of co-integration, VECM and TVECM models. Before presenting the results, it is important to show the contribution of provinces in the wheat production of the country. This is meant to provide an idea regarding the trade flow of wheat within the different provinces of Pakistan. Table 1 presents province wise area and production of wheat crop in Pakistan. The statistics depicts that in the cropping year 1987-88, 7308.4 thousand hectares were sown, producing 12675 thousand tonnes of wheat. Both the area under wheat crop as well as production increased in the last twenty-five years, however, area increased only by over one thousand hectares, while production almost doubled until the year 2011-12 as compared to 1987-88.

Table 1. **Area and Production of Wheat Crop in Pakistan and Provinces in the Years 1987-88 and 2011-12. Area in 1000 Hectares and Production in 1000 Tonnes**

Particulars	1987-88		2011-12	
	Area	Production	Area	Production
Pakistan	7308.40	12674.40	8649.80	23473.40
Punjab	5343.80 (73 %)	9203.80 (73 %)	6482.90 (75 %)	17738.90 (75 %)
Sindh	1024.80 (14 %)	2180.40 (17 %)	1049.20 (12 %)	3761.50 (16 %)
KPK	756.50 (10 %)	899.20 (7 %)	729.30 (8 %)	1130.30 (5 %)
Baluchistan	183.30 (3 %)	391.00 (3 %)	388.40 (5 %)	842.70 (4 %)

Source: Agricultural Statistics of Pakistan, 1987-88 and 2011-12.

Contributions of the provinces in area and production show that Punjab is and was the single largest contributor in terms of production of wheat as well as in the area sown under wheat. Punjab alone contributed 73 percent of area and production in the year 1987-88. This share increased to 75 percent until the year 2011-12. Area and production of Punjab in the year 2011-12 was 6482.90 thousand hectares and 17738.90 thousand tonnes, respectively. Area sown in Sindh, KPK and Baluchistan in the year 2011-12 was 1049.20, 729.30 and 388.40 thousand hectares, respectively, and production in the same year was 3761.50, 1130.30 and 842.70 thousands tonnes, respectively. The percentage share of Sindh and KPK in area sown under wheat crop, as well as, production has decreased over the last two decades.

Pakistan has remained largely a net importer of wheat during most of the last 25 years, with a small exporting period between the years 2000 to 2006 (3). Unfortunately, historical data of wheat consumption are not available as readily as data on production. Province wise consumption requirements data are especially difficult to find. As this paper focuses on regional market price series of wheat from different provinces, it is, therefore, necessary to have an idea of the demand in different provinces. Due to the aforementioned data availability constraint, shortfall of wheat for the year 2008 is presented here to give an idea of wheat deficient provinces (Fig. 2). As it turns out, Punjab is the only province of Pakistan having a surplus in wheat production, producing about 16-17 million tonnes of wheat every year with a consumption requirement of 12.5 million tonnes in the province.

Further, Sindh, Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) provinces are deficient in wheat production hence trade takes place more from Punjab to these provinces. In most cases, government transports wheat from the stock of


Fig. 2. Wheat production and shortfall province-wise report 2008
Source: UN inter-agency assessment report 2008

wheat procured during the harvest season or finances the private sector to transport to wheat-deficit areas of the country, to offset the costs of transportation. Sindh has a wheat production shortfall mainly because its capital Karachi, which comprises dense urban population, is also the main port where imports arrive. The urban population of Karachi is the primary wheat import consumers. KPK is the largest wheat deficit province requiring the allocation of more than two million MT annually. These provinces buy wheat either from PASSCO or from the Punjab food department. KPK shares the porous border with Afghanistan and a large share of wheat is sent to Afghanistan as informal trade rather than reaching local consumers (UN inter-agency assessment report 2008).

Unit Root Test results of wheat prices

Results of the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test for logged price series of five regional markets of wheat in Pakistan at levels and at first differences are presented in Table 2. These results indicate that the null hypothesis of a unit root in all the five markets cannot be rejected for the levels, because ADF statistics were not smaller than critical value at five percent significant level provided by Dickey and Fuller (10). To check the stationarity in the price series at first differences, the ADF test was re-applied to the differenced price series. The ADF statistics indicate the rejection of null hypothesis of a unit root significantly, implying that all of the price series are stationary at first differences.

Table 2. Unit Root Test Results of Logged monthly Wholesale Prices of Wheat Markets.

Markets	Levels	1st Difference
Hyderabad	-0.176	-14.413***
Lahore	0.110	-12.821***
Multan	-0.218	-12.415***
Peshawar	-0.470	-13.936***
Rawalpindi	-0.096	-13.706***

Critical values: 1% level 5% and 10% respectively are -3.454, -2.872, -2.573, Source: Author's own calculations.

Since the results indicate that the price series of wheat markets under study are first-difference stationary, one can infer that all five series are integrated of order one, i.e. (1). Thus, co-integration tests can be applied to see whether there are long run relationship between the markets.

Co-integration test results

Pair-wise co-integration test results for selected wheat markets are presented in Table 3. The data clearly indicate the existence of a long-run equilibrium relationship between all the pairs of regional wheat markets. Both trace statistics and maximum eigen value statistics suggest a co-integration relation in all the ten pairs of five markets. It can be concluded that there is a strong long-run relationship between wheat markets of Pakistan.

Table 4 presents the results of joint co-integration tests for all five wheat markets of Pakistan. The trace statistics as well as the maximum eigenvalue statistics suggest that all the five markets are co-integrated and converge to the long-run equilibrium.

Test results reveal that there are four co-integrating relationships in the joint co-integration analysis of all five wheat markets. As, there can be at most K-1 co-integration vectors in the joint co-integration test (16). Where, "K" indicates the number of variables in the system. This implies that there are four linear independent combinations of the variables; each combination is stationary. It also shows that there is at least one common stochastic trend.

The only relevant study of market integration regarding food markets of Pakistan comes from Mushtaque (25), who studied the wheat markets of Pakistan. Other studies, including Kurosaki (20), Mushtaque (24), Tahir and Riaz (29) and Zahid (30) limited their studies to the Punjab province of Pakistan. Some of them have focused on either southern or northern regions of Punjab, or on different commodities like cotton, gram, rice and fruits and vegetables. All of them have restrained themselves to co-integration, and not a single author has used threshold models to analyze integration of markets.

Table 3. Pair-Wise Cointegration Test Results Logged Wheat Market prices

Market Pairs	Null Hypothesis	Alternate Hypothesis	Trace Statistics	Maximum Eigenvalue Statistics
LogLahore-LogHyd	r=0	r≥1	41.284 (15.494)***	41.251 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.033 (3.841)	0.033 (3.841)
LogLahore-LogMultan	r=0	r≥1	32.892 (15.494)***	32.891 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.000 (3.841)	0.000 (3.841)
LogLahore-LogPindi	r=0	r≥1	54.744 (15.494)***	54.744 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.000 (3.841)	0.000 (3.841)
LogLahore-LogPeshawer	r=0	r≥1	16.853 (15.494)***	16.838 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.014 (3.841)	0.014 (3.841)
LogHyd-LogMultan	r=0	r≥1	40.627 (15.494)***	40.598 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.029 (3.841)	0.029 (3.841)
LogHyd-LogPindi	r=0	r≥1	38.019 (15.49)***	37.992 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.026 (3.841)	0.026 (3.841)
LogHyd-LogPeshawer	r=0	r≥1	22.452 (15.494)***	22.383 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.068 (3.841)	0.068 (3.841)
LogMultan-LogPeshawer	r=0	r≥1	15.731 (15.494)**	15.710 (14.264)**
	r≤1	r≥2	0.020 (3.841)	0.020 (3.841)
LogMultan-LogPindi	r=0	r≥1	43.079 (15.494)***	43.076 (14.264)***
	r≤1	r≥2	0.003 (3.841)	0.003 (3.841)
LogPindi-LogPeshawer	r=0	r≥1	15.984 (15.494)**	15.967 (14.264)**
	r≤1	r≥2	0.016 (3.841)	0.016 (3.841)

Critical values at 95% confidence interval are in parenthesis. Source: Author's calculations

Table 4.   Joint Cointegration Test Results Logged Wheat Market prices

Equation Tested	Null Hypothesis	Alternate Hypothesis	Trace Statistics	Maximum Eigenvalue Statistics
LogHyd	r = 0	r ≥ 1	171.08 (69.818)***	59.278 (33.876)***
LogLahore-	r ≤ 1	r ≥ 2	111.80 (47.856)***	50.844 (27.584)***
LogMultan	r ≤ 2	r ≥ 3	60.962 (29.797)***	44.989 (21.131)***
LogPindi	r ≤ 3	r ≥ 4	15.973 (15.494)**	15.900 (14.264)**
LogPeshawer	r≤4	r≥5	0.073 (3.841)	0.073 (3.841)

Critical values at 95% confidence interval are in parenthesis. Source: Author's calculations

Zahid (30) tested spatial market integration in different wheat markets in Northern Punjab, Pakistan. They applied the Engle and Granger test of co-integration to analyze long-run market integration between Lahore as a central market and five other markets of Northern Punjab. They found some markets only partially integrated because of long distance, lesser information flow and different socio-economic conditions.

Tahir and Riaz (29) tested integration of agricultural commodity markets of cotton, wheat, and rice in southeastern Punjab. They concluded that cotton, wheat and rice markets in southeastern Punjab are well integrated in the long-run only. In a few special cases, short-run integration was significant. Mushtaque (25) analyzed the same prices series of wheat markets, which are covered here, and concluded on the basis of co-integration tests that except Peshawar, the remaining four markets Hyderabad, Lahore, Multan and Rawalpindi are well integrated. In contrast, our study shows that all the wheat markets under study are co-integrated including Peshawar.

Linear VECM results

The error Correction Model (ECM) was applied to estimate a long-term coefficient alongwith short-term dynamics. The results (Table 5) show a highly significant adjustment of prices in almost all the

pairs of markets except the Hyderabad market. Adjustment to equilibrium from the Hyderabad market is slower as well as insignificant in some cases because this market is far away from the other four markets but still well connected

to Lahore, Multan and Rawalpindi by means of transport and communication. Hence, there is no surprise in the quicker response of the above markets to Hyderabad.

Table 5. VECM Results of Wheat Markets of Pakistan

Logged Wheat Market Pairs	Speed of Adjustment	Logged Wheat Market Pairs	Speed of Adjustment
LogLahore-LogHyd	-0.183 *** 0.050	LogHyd-LogPindi	-0.085* 0.156***
LogLahore-LogMultan	-0.249*** 0.063	LogHyd-LogPeshawer	-0.033 0.095***
LogLahore-LogPindi	-0.171*** 0.177**	LogMultan-LogPeshawer	-0.037** 0.068***
LogLahore-LogPeshawer	-0.041* 0.060**	LogMultan-LogPindi	-0.047 0.246***
LogHyd-LogMultan	-0.090** 0.151***	LogPindi-LogPeshawer	-0.042* 0.057**

Note: *, ** and *** show the significance at 90%, 95% and 99%., Source: Author's calculations

Due to the favorable infrastructure in Lahore and Rawalpindi and higher demand because of dense urban population in these areas, wheat trade to these markets from other parts of the country pushes them to adjust to the equilibrium quickly. Lahore, Multan and Rawalpindi are also well connected as well as close to each other as compared to the other markets under study. Multan is a bigger region in terms of production of wheat. Therefore, both Lahore and Rawalpindi markets adjust quickly to Multan. Lahore is also one of the major markets in which multidirectional trade takes place. Apart from that, these results are from a linear VECM model without considering transaction costs. However, these results may differ when incorporating transaction costs into the threshold model.

Testing for thresholds

The Sup*LM* test for threshold co-integration clearly rejects the null hypothesis of linear co-integration against the alternate hypothesis of threshold co-integration at the 5 percent significance level. This holds true for seven out of ten pairs of different wheat market price series of Pakistan. While, for three pairs of price series namely Multan-Peshawar, Hyderabad-Peshawar and Lahore-Peshawar, the null hypothesis is rejected at 10 percent significance level. The Sup*LM* test results provide enough conclusive evidence of threshold co-integration to justify an application of the TVECM to the data. Estimates of Sup*LM* test with one lag and 5000 bootstrap replications on price series of wheat markets of Pakistan are provided in Table 6.

Table 6. Sup*LM* Test Results for Wheat Markets of Pakistan

Market Pairs	Cointegration Vector β	Threshold Parameter γ	Sup*LM* Test Value	Critical Value	(P-Value)
LogLahore - LogHyd	-1.006	-0.066	20.161	18.828	0.026
LogLahore - LogMultan	-0.982	0.139	20.414	19.334	0.031
LogLahore - LogPindi	-0.962	0.230	34.650	16.117	0.000
LogLahore - LogPeshawer	-0.997	0.018	16.865	17.464	0.063
LogHyd - LogMultan	-0.976	0.153	19.461	15.714	0.008
LogHyd - LogPindi	-0.954	0.179	26.348	15.554	0.000
LogHyd - LogPeshawer	-0.982	0.074	17.575	18.388	0.080
LogMultan - LogPeshawer	-0.978	0.077	27.437	18.868	0.000
LogMultan - LogPindi	-1.011	-0.112	17.415	18.558	0.084
LogPindi - LogPeshawer	-1.036	-0.272	18.503	15.252	0.012

Source: Author's calculations

Threshold Vector Error Correction Model

Table 7 presents the estimation results for the TVECM model with two thresholds (three regimes). The band between the two thresholds (regime two or middle regime) is the band of non-adjustment because deviations from the long-term equilibrium as compared to adjustment costs are so small that these will not cause an adjustment process of related prices within the band. As expected, the threshold error-correction model produced different results from previous simple model. Co-integration clearly describes the long-run relationship among different wheat markets of Pakistan, and it can be seen from threshold model that short-run adjustment to disequilibrium is somehow mixed. The results reveal that some market pairs show higher adjustment in both regimes, while others only indicate significant adjustment either in the upper or in the lower regime. Meyer (22) referred to price adjustment due to disequilibrium in one direction or in one regime to be insignificant, considering the unidirectional trade flows or significant transaction costs. The adjustment parameters are

Table 7. TVECM Results of Wheat Markets of Pakistan

Market Pairs	Regimes	Speed of Adjustment	Constant	P_{1t-1}	P_{2t-1}
LLHR LHYD	Lower Regime	-0.098 (0.193) 0.124 (0.087)*	0.010 (0.056)* 0.012 (0.021)**	0.081 (0.318) -0.043 (0.579)	-0.039 (0.665) 0.270 (0.001)***
	Upper regime	-0.686 (0.001)*** -0.343 (0.099)*	0.036 (0.017)** 0.036 (0.013)**	0.029 (0.856) -0.101 (0.513)	0.011 (0.967) 0.349 (0.171)
LLHR LMLTN	Lower Regime	-0.324 (0.227) 0.651 (0.007)***	0.004 (0.752) 0.024 (0.022)**	-0.319 (0.100) -0.355 (0.041)**	0.221 (0.247) 0.346 (0.044)**
	Upper regime	0.188 (0.321) 0.369 (0.030)**	-0.023 (0.163) -0.029 (0.047)**	0.044 (0.735) 0.262 (0.024)**	0.237 (0.121) 0.195 (0.154)
LLHR LPINDI	Lower Regime	0.022 (0.801) 0.402 (2.9e-5)***	0.014 (0.004)*** 0.023 (3.2e-5)***	0.032 (0.750) -0.120 (0.268)	0.130 (0.170) 0.402 (0.000)***
	Upper regime	-0.089 (0.589) 0.156 (0.376)	0.004 (0.705) 0.004 (0.714)	0.222 (0.157) -0.152 (0.366)	0.159 (0.316) 0.283 (0.097)*
LLHR LPSHWR	Lower Regime	-0.029 (0.567) 0.094 (0.126)	0.008 (0.230) 0.007 (0.376)	0.270 (0.011)** 0.110 (0.395)	0.047 (0.522) 0.237 (0.008)***
	Upper regime	-0.292 (3.7e-5)*** -0.070 (0.404)	0.039 (3.4e-6)*** 0.018 (0.063)*	0.343 (0.000)*** 0.200 (0.086)*	0.009 (0.938) 0.252 (0.072)*
LHYD LMLTN	Lower Regime	-0.190 (0.490) 1.115 (1.0e-5)***	-0.004 (0.863) 0.097 (8.2e-6)***	-0.202 (0.375) 0.069 (0.738)	0.333 (0.026)** 0.248 (0.065)*
	Upper regime	-0.361 (0.042)** 0.004 (0.980)	0.032 (0.055)* 0.016 (0.286)	0.283 (0.006)*** 0.170 (0.067)*	-0.113 (0.374) 0.039 (0.732)
LHYD LPINDI	Lower Regime	-0.492 (0.001)*** -0.263 (0.146)	-0.015 (0.090)* -0.022 (0.033)**	0.284 (0.064)* 0.151 (0.399)	0.023 (0.838) 0.094 (0.474)
	Upper regime	-0.118 (0.298) 0.237 (0.075)*	0.017 (0.212) -0.013 (0.423)	-0.021 (0.870) -0.010 (0.949)	-0.029 (0.778) 0.044 (0.713)
LHYD LPSHWR	Lower Regime	-0.016 (0.772) 0.250 (0.000)***	0.007 (0.145) 0.011 (0.046)**	0.181 (0.118) -0.366 (0.008)***	0.036 (0.630) 0.569 (0.000)***
	Upper regime	-0.310 (7.4e-5)*** -0.125 (0.173)	0.045 (4.6e-6)*** 0.029 (0.014)**	0.120 (0.183) 0.189 (0.077)*	-0.043 (0.683) 0.135 (0.287)
LMLTN LPINDI	Lower Regime	-0.283 (0.175) 0.801 (0.000)***	-0.004 (0.768) 0.057 (0.001)**	0.338 (0.032)** 0.292 (0.104)	0.121 (0.382) 0.240 (0.130)
	Upper regime	0.043 (0.699) 0.369 (0.004)***	0.006 (0.452) -0.003 (0.779)	0.041 (0.784) -0.178 (0.290)	0.081 (0.554) 0.123 (0.428)
LMLTN LPSHWR	Lower Regime	-0.099 (0.003)*** 0.031 (0.490)	-0.002 (0.627) 0.002 (0.725)	0.366 (2.4e-5)*** -0.013 (0.910)	-0.078 (0.164) 0.192 (0.009)**
	Upper regime	-0.235 (0.012)** -0.213 (0.082)*	0.030 (0.009)*** 0.045 (0.003)***	0.366 (0.000)*** 0.222 (0.121)	-0.105 (0. 343) -0.049 (0.734)
LPINDI LPSHWR	Lower Regime	-0.126 (0.012)* 0.034 (0.523)	-0.011 (0.164) -0.001 (0.992)	0.249 (0.007)*** -0.079 (0.414)	0.020 (0.819) 0.351 (0.000)***
	Upper regime	-0.207 (0.009)*** -0.041 (0.630)	0.018 (0.002)*** 0.015 (0.017)**	0.142 (0.201) 0.054 (0.644)	0.147 (0.230) 0.104 (0.421)

Source: Author's calculations

higher and significant in most cases as compared to the results of the linear VECM, which shows that the threshold model describes the short-run adjustment in the prices as quicker and higher in magnitude.

Lahore and Hyderabad markets adjust quickly, when the shock is higher than the second threshold, which implies that prices adjust quickly when these are higher and adjustment is slow when the price difference is below the lower threshold. Lahore being the major production and consumption region in Punjab province of Pakistan forces other markets of Punjab, namely Rawalpindi and Multan to adjust quickly. These two markets are close to Lahore in terms of distance and are well connected through favorable infrastructure supporting transportation. This holds equally true in terms of information and communication. The linear VECM estimated a higher extent of adjustment for the Lahore market, which was somewhat surprising as Lahore market is considered the leader rather than the follower.

In most cases, higher and significant adjustments revealed by the estimation occur in the upper regime. When these deviations are above the second threshold and provide the opportunity for traders to take advantage of the arbitrage, then as expected, prices adjust quickly to form a new equilibrium.

CONCLUSION

The results agree largely with the existing literature and conclude that the wheat markets of Pakistan are very well integrated in the long-run. However, short-run adjustments only occur when price deviates above the threshold. Further, non-linear threshold co-integration suggests higher adjustment as compared to linear VECM, where the role of transaction costs is ignored. Higher adjustment coefficients obtained from the application of threshold model raises the same question of justification for government interventions, as raised earlier by Mushtaque (25), Dorosh (12) and some others. Wheat being the major staple food has been center of the extensive and costly government interventions,

because its availability and access to the whole population is linked with food security, which is a major concern for Pakistan. Estimated results, based on the different wheat markets of Pakistan, reveal that wheat markets are well integrated, which ultimately leaves the impression of efficient market functioning. Hence, the expensive interventions of the government should be reduced and private sector should be allowed to trade wheat within the country, and invest in the wheat storage and transportation, which will not only reduce the burden of the economy but will also increase the effectiveness of arbitrage and the efficiency of market functioning.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, M., C. Cororaton, A. Qayum, A. and M. Iqbal. 2006. Impact of domestic policies towards agricultural trade bliberalization and market reform on food security in Pakistan. Paper presented in International Conference on trade Liberalization and Food Security in South Asia: The Lessons Learnt. New Delhi, India, June 8-9, 2006.

2. Alonso, E. B., and J. Swinnen. 2016. Who are the producers and consumers? Value chains and food policy effects in the wheat sector in Pakistan. Food Policy, 61, 40-58.

3. Anon. 2011-12. Economic Survey of Pakistan. Ministry of Finance, Government of Pakistan.

4. Asteriou, D. and S. G. Hall. 2007. Applied Econometrics: A Modern Approach Using Eviews and Microfit. Revised Edition. Palgrave Macmillan.

5. Balke, N.S. and T. B. Fomby. 1997. Threshold cointegration. Int. Eco. Rev. 38(3):627-645.

6. Barrett, C.B. and J. R. Li. 2002. Distinguishing between equilibrium and integration in spatial price analysis. Am. J. Agric. Eco. 84(2):292-307.

7. Barrett, C.B. 1996. Market analysis methods: are our enriched toolkits well-suited to enlivened markets? Amer. J. Agric. Eco. 78(3), 825-829.

8. Baulch, B. 1997. Transfer costs, spatial arbitrage, and testing for food market

integration. Amer. J. Agric. Eco. 79(2):477-487.

9. Brooks, C. 2008. Introductory Econometrics for Finance. 2nd Ed. Cambridge University Press.

10. Dickey, D.A. and W. A. Fuller. 1979. Distribution of the estimation for autoregressive time series with a unit root". J. Am. Statist. Assoc. 74(366):427-431.

11. Dickey, D.A. and W. A. Fuller. 1981. Likelihood ratio statistics for autoregressive time Series with a unit root. Econometrica. 49(4):1057-1072.

12. Dorosh, P.A. and A. Salam. 2008. Wheat markets and price stabilization in Pakistan: An analysis of Policy Options. Pak. Develop. Rev. 47(1):71-87.

13. Engle, R. F and Granger, C. W. J. 1987. Co-integration and error-correction: Representation, estimation, and testing. Econometrica, 55(2):251-276.

14. Goodwin, B.K. and N. E. Piggott. 2001. Spatial market integration in the presence of threshold effects. Amer. J. Agric. Eco. 83(2):302-317.

15. Greb, F., N. Jamora, C. Mengel, S. V. Cramon-Taubadel and N. Würriehausen. 2012. Price Transmission from International to Domestic Markets. Global Food Discussion Paper.

16. Greene, W. H. 2003. *Econometric Analysis*. 5th Ed. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

17. Hansen, B.E. and B. Seo. 2002. Testing for two-regime threshold co-integration in Vector Error Correction Models. J. Eco. 110(2):293-318.

18. Hassouneh, I., S. V. Cramon-Taubadel, T. Serra and J. M. Gil. 2012. Recent developments in the econometric analysis of price transmission. TRANSFOP (Transparency of Food Pricing) Working Paper No. 2.

19. Johansen, S. 1988. Statistical analysis of cointegration vectors. J. Eco. Dynam. Contr. 12(2-3):231-254.

20. Kurosaki, T. (1996). Government interventions, market integration, and price risk in Pakistan's Punjab. The Pak. Dev. Rev. 35(2):129-144.

21. Lo, M. C. and E. Zivot. 2001. Threshold cointegration and non-linear adjustment to the law of one price. Macroeconomic Dynamics, 5(4), 533-576.

22. Meyer, J. 2004. Measuring market integration in the presence of transaction costs-a threshold vector error correction approach. Agric. Eco. 31(2-3):327-334.

23. Meyer, J. and S. V. Cramon-Taubadel. 2004. Asymmetric price transmission: a survey. J. Agric. Eco. 55(3):581-611.

24. Mushtaque, K., A. Gafoor and M. Dad. 2008. Apple market integration: implications for sustainable agricultural development. The Labour Journal of Economics. 13(1):129-138.

25. Mushtaque, K., F. Abbass, and Abdullah. 2007. Government intervention and market integration in prominent wheat markets of Pakistan. Pak. J. Agric. Sci. 44(2):356-360.

26. Seo, M. 2006. Bootstrap testing for the null of no co-integration in a threshold vector error correction model" J. Eco. 127(1):1-27.

27. Sexton, R. J., C. L. Kling, and H. F. Carman. 1991. Market integration, efficiency of arbitrage, and imperfect competition: methodology and application to U.S. celery. Amer. J. Agric. Eco. 73(3):568–580.

28. Stigler, M. 2010. Threshold cointegration: overview and implementation in R. R package version 0.7-2.

29. Tahir, Z. and K. Riaz. 1997. Integration of agricultural commodity markets in Punjab" The Pak. Dev. Rev. 36(3):241-262.

30. Zahid, M.S., A. Qayyum and W. S. Malik. 2007. Dynamics of wheat market integration in northern Punjab, Pakistan. The Pak. Dev. Rev. 46(4):817-830.

CONTRIBUTION OF AUTHROS

| Jam Gulam Murtaza Sahito | Sole author of this paper, conducted research and prepared writeup |