Capital Flight: China's Experience

Yin-Wong Cheung
Xingwang Qian

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2931
CATEGORY 7: MONETARY POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
JANUARY 2010

CESifo *Working Paper No. 2931*

Capital Flight: China's Experience

Abstract

We study the empirical determinants of China's capital flight. In addition to the covered interest differential, our empirical exercise includes a rather exhaustive list of macroeconomic variables and a few institutional factors. Overall, our regression exercise shows that China's capital flight is quite well explained by its own history and covered interest differentials. The other possible determinants offer relatively small additional explanatory power. It is also found that China's capital flight responds differently to the components of covered interest differentials and to the positive and negative components of these variables. The response pattern, however, depends on the choice of data frequency. The general impression is that the monthly results are more intuitive than the quarterly ones.

JEL-Code: F30, F32, G15.

Keywords: covered interest differential, forward premium, expected depreciation, asymmetric response, macro determinants.

Yin-Wong Cheung
Department of Economics E2
University of California, Santa Cruz
USA – Santa Cruz, CA 95064
cheung@ucsc.edu

Xingwang Qian
Economics and Finance Department
SUNY Buffalo State College
1300 Elmwood Ave
Buffalo, NY 14222
qianx@buffalostate.edu

Cheung acknowledges the financial support of faculty research funds of the University of California, Santa Cruz.

1. Introduction

In the midst of the current financial crisis, it is hard to under-estimate China's role in the global economy. Since its open door policy was initiated in 1978, China has swiftly ascended to the league of major players in the world economy. Echoing its growing economic prowess, China has stepped up its interactions with the rest of the world apace.

Over the last two decades, China has strengthened its levels of trade and financial integration with the world economy, albeit at uneven paces. There is a plethora of analyses on China's trade integration. These studies usually emphasize China's supercharged export performance, the pressure of her demand on commodity prices, and the link between Chinese renminbi (RMB) valuation and global imbalances.[1] China's ability to draw in huge amounts of foreign direct investment (FDI); especially compared with its role as a provider in the world capital market, and its astonishing rate of accumulating international reserves in the new millennium also have attracted consideration attention in both academic and policy circles.[2] While a large collection of studies has accumulated in the last decade or so, there is still much to be done to understand the intricate relationship between China and the world economy.

The current study examines China's capital flight – an illicit financial channel through which China interacts with the world economy. Capital flight could be seen as a consequence of distortions induced by the political structure and the fiscal, monetary, and exchange rate policies. Indeed, China's capital flight is quite substantial. A quick check on the data shows that, in the 2000s, quarterly illicit capital outflows and inflows could be larger than the official FDI or the change in the external debts in the corresponding period.

Given its size, capital flight could have significant implications for the Chinese economy. For instance, it could adversely affect China's economy by draining needed resources from the domestic market and reducing the effectiveness of monetary and exchange rate policies. Capital flight also has implications for China's policy of further liberalizing its capital management policy. In general, a sudden and severe capital flight could inflict huge pains on an economy – the recent crises abound with examples of the detrimental impact of capital flight.[3]

---

[1] See, for example, Blanchard and Giavazz (2006), Cheung *et al.* (2007a, b), Feenstra and Wei (2009), Lane and Schmukler (2007), Obstfeld (2006), and Rodrik (2006).

[2] See, for example, Eichengreen and Tong (2007), Cheung and Qian (2009), Jeanne (2007), Hale and Long (forthcoming), and Prasad and Wei (2007).

[3] See, for example, Harrigan *et al.* (2002), Pastor (1990), and Rojas-Suarez (1990).

Given China's current stage of development and its proclaimed gradualism reform approach, one expects the conditions and environment that give rise to capital flight will exist and persist for awhile. The extant academic studies focus on measuring China's capital flight and, at the same time, recognize a few determinants including exchange rate policy, preferential treatments for foreign capital, domestic and foreign return differentials; see, for example, Gunter (1996, 2004), Ljungwall and Wang (2008), Sicular (1998), and Wu and Tang (2000).[4]

One hurdle facing studies on capital flight is the measurement issue. There are different interpretations of the term capital flight. One definition equates capital flight to cross-border fund movements that are taken to evade official capital control regulations. In this case, capital flight has no official record and, thus, it is hard to make a precise assessment of the size of capital flight. In this study, we adopt a commonly used procedure called the World Bank residual method to assess the magnitude of capital flight. Essentially, the residual method measures the capital flight by the difference between the reported capital inflow and outflow.

A key explanatory variable of our basic empirical framework is the covered interest differential, which measures the deviation from covered interest parity. The role of covered interest differentials is quite intuitive – one expects capital flight responds to covered interest differential advantages. The basic framework also include standard economic determinants such as exchange rate volatility, real GDP growth, external debts, fiscal deficit, openness, real estate market index, and international reserves.

The basic framework will be extended in several directions. First, we introduce some China-specific institutional factors. The China-specific institutional factors include a political risk index, a dummy variable allowing for the effect of the US-China Strategic Economic Dialogue, a dummy variable for exchange rate policy reform, and a dummy variable tracking the evolution of China's capital control policy. It is anticipated that these factors could signal the path of RMB exchange rate in the near future and, thus, affect capital flight.

Second, we examine the presence of asymmetric responses to positive and negative covered returns. Outward and inward capital flights could be triggered by motivations other than searching for returns. For instance, in addition to capturing superior returns, outward capital flight is typical in developing countries for avoiding unfavorable political and economic

[4] It is noted that the cointegration between capital flight and its determinants reported in Ljungwall and Wang (2008, Table 2) does not exist when the relevant finite sample critical values (Cheung and Lai, 1993) are used.

conditions. Thus, capital flight might respond differently to positive and negative covered interest differentials.

Third, we will examine the role of expected RMB depreciation. The main difference between expected RMB depreciation (RMB forward premium) and covered interest parity deviation is given by the US and Chinese interest rate differential. One may argue that the use of covered interest parity deviation may be too stringent as it involves Chinese money markets that are not accessible to everyone. On the other hand, the off-shore non-deliverable RMB forwards are not (officially) subject to China's jurisdiction and, thus, could be viewed as a market indicator of expected currency movement. According to standard theory, expected currency depreciation (appreciation) could trigger capital outflow (inflow).

Fourth, studies on capital flight based on the World Bank residual method usually examine quarterly capital flight data. It is because the residual method uses balance of payments statistics, which are typically available at the quarterly frequency, to calculate capital flight information. Since capital could be transferred electronically rather than physically in the modern world, it is not unreasonable to expect that capital flight could respond to changes in economic and political situations in a relatively short period of time. If it is the case, then a natural concern is that the use of quarterly data could make it difficult, if not impossible, to reveal the interactions between capital flight and its determinants. Thus, it could be instructive to examine capital flight behaviour at, say, the monthly frequency. To this end, we employ the Chow and Lin (1971) method to construct monthly capital flight data and compare the results from regression analyses based on quarterly and monthly capital flight data.

2. Capital Flight

The adverse effects of capital flight on the originating economy are quite well recognized in the literature.[5] The operational definition of capital flight, nonetheless, could be quite elusive and it covers a wide spectrum. The main difference between alternative measures of capital flight is the types of capital flow included in their calculations. It should be noted that, despite the usual connotation of illegality, capital flight could, at least, technically speaking have taken place

[5] See, for example, Boyce and Ndikumana(2001), Cuddington (1986), Dooley *et al.* (1986), Dornbusch (1984), and Khan and Haque (1987).

via either legal or illegal channels. Thus, these measures could be interpreted as estimates of unrecorded, instead of illegal, transactions.

Figure 1: China's Capital flight



Figure 1 graphs the time profiles of China's annual capital flight derived from the World Bank residual measure, the hot money measure, and the errors and omissions entry in the balance of payments statistics.[6] The residual measure is arguably the most commonly used measure in literature while the hot money measure is also often considered (Cuddington, 1986; World Bank, 1985). While the errors and omissions entry mostly reflects the (net) unrecorded capital flow, it is a main component of other capital flight measures (Prasad and Wei, 2007).

It is evidenced that these measures give a qualitatively similar portrait of the capital flight pattern. In essence, capital flight was relatively mild before the 1990. It started to pick up in the 1990s and exhibited substantial swings in the new millennium. The World Bank residual method indicates some minute inward capital flight from 1985 to 1989 that could be induced by China's

[6] Another popular measure of capital flight is the Dooley approach, which is shown to be a variant of the residual approach (Claessens and Naudé, 1993; Dooley, 1986, 1988). Also, individual measures of capital flight could be combined to form new alternative measures; see for example, Claessens and Naudé (1993) and Kar and Cartwright-Smith (2008).

current account deficits in those years.[7] Another recorded inward capital flight occurs around 2004 – explanations offered in the media often point to the intense market expectations about RMB appreciation and the bubbly Chinese real estate market in that period. Comparing the three measures, the World Bank residual method gives the most volatile measure of capital flight.

Figure 2: China's capital flight and FDI, nomalized by China's fixed assets investment



To gauge its economic relevance, we plot China's capital flight and FDI inflow normalized by its fixed assets investment in Figure 2. China's fixed assets investment is deemed to be a crucial factor driving its phenomenal growth. The residual method shows that capital flight could be more than 20% of fixed assets investment. The FDI capital is another significant driving force behind China's phenomenal growth. These ratios suggest that capital flight could easily offset, if not dwarf, FDI flow to China. The economic implication of China's capital flight is quite obvious if the capital transferring out of China is as productive as FDI.

With all its capital control measures in place, how could China have such volatile capital flight? Anecdotal evidence, indeed, has suggested that capital controls are always porous and (illicit) capital flows are not completely shut. A good share of historical capital movements occurs outside of formal regulations, as indicated by the errors and omissions entry of the

[7] Gunter (2004) reports inward capital flight in 1985, but not for the 1986-1989 period. The difference could be due to data revision.

balance of payments statistics. Even in the early stage of China's open door policy, capital flight is attributed to corrupted officials running state owned enterprises and beneficiaries of corruption and economic crimes. It is perceived that, taking advantage of regulatory loopholes, banks and corporations shuttle money in and out of the economy via, say, unrecorded cross-border transactions and mis-invoicing. Even China's capital controls present significant barriers for capital movements, they are not watertight and, apparently, do not dampen capital flight over time.

3. Empirical Analyses

The subsequent empirical analyses are based on capital flight data derived from the World Bank residual method, which is commonly adopted in empirical studies. A few advantages of the residual method are a) its broad coverage, b) it is intuitive, and c) it could be easily replicated.[8] In essence, the residual method obtains an indirect measure of capital flight by comparing the "sources of funds" and "uses of funds." According to the World Bank residual method, capital flight is given by

$$\textit{Capital flight} = \Delta ExD + NFDI - CAD - \Delta IR,$$

where ΔExD is the change in external debts, *NFDI* is the net foreign direct investment; *CAD* is the current account deficit, and ΔIR is the change in international reserves. There is outward (*inward*) capital flight when the recorded sources of funds given by increases in external debts and net FDI inflow are larger (*smaller*) than the recorded uses of funds given by current account deficit and international reserve accumulation. A brief description of this method and some other measures of capital flight is given in the Appendix.

When capital flight is positive, resources are leaving the country and not servicing the domestic economy. Alternatively, it reflects some disutility of domestic assets. When capital flight is negative, we have *inward* capital flight; that is, there is a relative preference for domestic assets.[9]

3.1 Basic Model

[8] See, for example, Claessens and Naudé (1993), Kant (1996), and Kar and Cartwright-Smith (2008) for a detailed description of various capital flight measures and their limitations.

[9] The media typically focuses on the "basic balance" given by *NFDI – CAD*. When the sum is in surplus, it means a net inflow of foreign exchange from the net trade proceeds and/or net foreign money into the economy for long-term investment, but these are not the total (portfolio) capital inflow.

One framework for analyzing capital flight is offered by the portfolio balance approach (Cuddington, 1986; Diwan, 1989; Dornbusch, 1984). Intuitively, an economy tends to experience a capital drain when it offers a rate of return lower than the rest of the world. A persistent return differential, net of transaction costs, is only possible in the presence of capital controls. In the absence of perfect capital controls, return differentials induce capital flow but the flow is not strong enough to equalize domestic and foreign returns. To capture the idea, we consider the regression equation

$$F_t = \alpha + \Sigma_i^p \beta_i F_{t-i} + \Sigma_i^q \lambda_i CID_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t, \qquad (1)$$

where F_t is the capital flight variable given by the stock of capital flight and CID_t is the covered interest differential that measures the deviation from covered interest parity between the Chinese RMB and the US dollar (US$).[10]

Our quarterly capital flight data are derived from the balance of payments statistics provided by the State Administration of Foreign Exchange, China. The stock of capital flight variable is obtained by compounding capital flight data using the US$ London interbank offer rates and then discounting the resulting series by the US inflation rates. The sample period is from 1999:Q1 to 2008:Q2, which is constrained by the availability of data required to construct the capital flight variable and data on other variables used in the subsequent analyses. The covered interest differential is calculated from the three-month RMB interbank offer rate, the three-month US$ London interbank offer rate, and the corresponding spot and non-deliverable forward rates of RMB against US$.[11] A larger covered interest differential represents a higher covered return on RMB investment.[12] See the Appendix for a detailed description of these and other variables used in the exercise.

Technically speaking, equation (1) is an agnostic regression examining the (Granger) causal effect of covered interest differential on capital flight. The coefficient λ_i gives the change in F_t for a unit change in CID_t . The lagged F_t's are included to control for spurious CID_t effects.

Before estimating equation (1), the Elliott, Rothenberg and Stock (1996) ADF-GLS unit root test, which assumes the highest test power, was used to determine the stationarity properties

[10] Studies examining the stock of capital flight include Collier *et al.* (1999), Cuddington (1987), and Rojas-Suarez (1990).

[11] Non-deliverable forward markets are described in, for example, Ma *et al.* (2004).

[12] The covered interest differential is sometimes associated with capital controls or the threat of their imposition. In general, see, for example, Aliber (1973), Dooley and Isard (1980) and Frankel and Engel (1984), and in the content of China, see, for example, Cheung *et al.* (2003) and Ma and McCauley (2008).

of F_t and CID_t. Specifically, the ADF-GLS$^\tau$ test that allows for a linear time trend was used. The lag structure of the test was determined by the Bayesian information criterion. See Elliott, Rothenberg, Stock (1996) for a detailed discussion of the test procedure. The test statistics calculated from the F_t and CID_t series are, respectively, -3.052 and -3.406 – both are significant and reject the unit-root null hypothesis (Cheung and Lai, 1995). Thus, equation (1) is not a spurious regression.

Table 1: Empirical Capital Flight Equations

	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.920***	0.916***	0.968***	0.911***	0.947***	0.960***	0.925***
	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.07)
CID(-1)	-0.074						
	(0.06)						
CID(-3)		-0.020***	-0.012*	-0.015***	-0.016**	-0.018**	-0.012*
		(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
dOPENNESS		0.485**	0.560**	0.484**	0.586**	0.613***	0.464*
		(0.19)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.21)	(0.24)
Ex_R			0.025**				0.027**
			(0.01)				(0.01)
SED				0.029*			0.031
				(0.02)			(0.02)
RISK					-0.002		0.000
					(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL						-0.001	0.010
						(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	-0.003	-0.001***	-0.003***	-0.002***	-0.002	-0.003	-0.004*
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	0.152	0.032***	0.039***	0.045***	0.133	0.042*	0.058
	(0.10)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.15)	(0.02)	(0.15)
Adj. R-squares	0.83	0.85	0.87	0.88	0.86	0.86	0.88
Obs.	37	35	35	35	35	35	35
Q-stat(4)	6.09	3.09	6.82	3.99	4.68	4.12	6.91
Q-stat(8)	7.51	3.73	8.12	8.87	8.49	7.05	9.52

Note: The table reports the results of estimating equations (1), (2) and (3). Column (2) gives results based on equation (1), column (3) gives results based on equation (2), and columns (4) to (8) report results based on equation (3). See the text for detail. Robust standard errors are given in the parentheses. "***", "**" and "*" denote significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. "Q-stat(4)" and "Q-stat(8)" are the Box-Ljung Q-statistics calculated from the first 4 and 8 estimated residual autocorrelations. None of the Q-statistics is significant.

The results of estimating (1) are reported in the second column of Table 1. The covered interest differential variable, CID, has a negative coefficient estimate. That is, a large covered return on RMB investment reduces capital flight; a result that is consistent with the conventional wisdom. Nevertheless, the coefficient estimate has a t-statistic of -1.23 and is insignificant at the conventional 5% level.

The use of quarterly data could also make it difficult to disentangle the covered interest differential effect if, for instance, capital flight adjusts in less than a quarter. Indeed, if the contemporaneous covered interest differential variable is included in the regression, it has a significant and negative estimate. Nonetheless, a contemporaneous association between F_t and CID_t does not offer an ambiguous interpretation of capital flight behavior. We explore the data frequency issue in the next sub-section.

Equation (1) is arguably simplistic for modeling capital flight. The absence of the relevant determinants could bias the estimation results. To better understand capital flight behavior, we extend (1) by including standard economic determinants of capital flight.

Drawing from the extant theoretical and empirical studies, we considered the following economic determinants of capital flight: China's real GDP growth rate, China's government deficit normalized by its GDP, the difference between the US and China inflation rates, the change in China's openness, the real estate investment return in China, and the change in China's international reserves normalized by its GDP. The last three variables deserve some comments. First, openness captures the import and export activity. It is perceived that capital flight could be related to mis-invoicing of exports and imports, which is a common strategy to evade capital controls and to move money in and out of China. Second, on the real estate market index, the strong Shanghai property market is perceived to be a triggering factor for hot money flowing into China started in 2003. Third, in the recent years, the rapid build-up of international reserves has brought China the pressure to move capital to overseas and, conceivably, to ease the effort to curb capital flight. Thus, it would be interesting to determine the empirical relevance of these variables to China's capital flight.

A description of these variables and their sources is provided in the Appendix. The theoretical links between these economic variables and capital flight are discussed in, for

example, Cuddington (1986), Dooley (1988), Dornbusch (1984).[13] We estimate the regression equation

$$F_t = \alpha + \Sigma_i^p \beta_i F_{t-i} + \Sigma_i^q \lambda_i CID_{t-i} + \theta' X_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad (2)$$

where X_t is a vector containing economic variables. In a pilot study, we found that these economic variables are mostly insignificant when they were included jointly or individually in (2). It turned out that only the openness variable, dOPENNESS, is significant in our regression analysis; the results are presented in column (3) of Table 1. The insignificant results pertaining to the other economic variables are not reported for brevity and are available from the authors.

The openness variable has a positive and significant coefficient estimate. It is noted that capital flight through mis-invoicing may not show up in the balance of payments statistics. Nonetheless, it is widely perceived that trade mis-invoicing via under- and over-invoicing imports and exports is a main conduit for capital flight. If the motivation behind mis-invoicing is in line with the general one behind capital flight, then openness could bear some information on capital flight. A higher level of openness offers a better chance to manipulate the reported trade prices and the related capital flight. Our estimation results are in accordance with such an interpretation - an increase in openness implies an increase in capital flight.

In the presence of the openness variable, the coefficient estimates of both the lagged capital flight and CID variables are smaller in magnitude. The CID variable is only significant at the third lag instead of the first one. The switch in the responding lag to three quarters is quite puzzling – does it take three quarters for capital movement to respond, on the margin, to a change in covered interest differential? We will come back to the CID lag structure later.

3.2 Extensions

In addition to economic variables, we consider some institutional factors that are specific to China. Specifically, we augment equation (2) with a dummy variable Ex_R that captures the July 2005 exchange rate policy reform, a dummy variable SED accounting for the effect of the US-China Strategic Economic Dialogue,[14] a political risk index RISK, and a dummy variable

[13] Also, see Boyce (1992), Conesa (1987); Cuddington (1986), Dooley (1986, 1988); Dornbusch (1984), Gibson and Tsakalotos (1993), Lessard and Williamson (1987), Mikkelsen (1991), and Smit and Mocke (1991).

[14] The first Strategic Economic Dialogue took place in December 2006. The Dialogue was re-named the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue in July 2009; see http://www.ustreas.gov/initiatives/us-china/index.shtml.

CONTROL tracking the evolution of China's capital control policy.[15] These institutional factors, a priori, signify certain economic and political conditions that could affect capital flight. Again, data on these factors are described in the Appendix. To accommodate these institutional factors, we modify equation (2) to

$$F_t = \alpha + \Sigma_i^p \beta_i F_{t-i} + \Sigma_i^q \lambda_i CID_{t-i} + \theta' X_t + \psi' Z_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad (3)$$

where Z_t is a vector containing institutional factors.

The results of adding each one of these factors and all four of them together are presented in columns (4) to (8) in Table 1. Individually, the exchange rate policy and Strategic Economic Dialogue variables have a positively significant impact and the two other factors have a negative but insignificant effect on capital flight.

The exchange rate policy variable effect is in accordance with the anecdotal evidence that the policy change released the pressure of a one-off sharp appreciation. Recall that the policy change announced on July 21st, 2005 was a long-anticipated one and was accompanied by one-off 2.1% revaluation. Since then, the jump risk of RMB is quite small and not a factor deterring capital flight. The positive effect of the Strategic Economic Dialogues variable effect is likely attributed to stern statements and the uncertainty related to the Dialogue's outcomes.

When the four factors are jointly included in the regression, the exchange rate policy dummy variable is the only significant institutional factor – indicating the implication of the policy change dominates the other three factors.

In general, the adjusted R-squares statistics that measure the goodness of fit suggest that the specifications based on the standard economic determinants and the selected China-specific factors perform quite well. All the reported models have an adjusted R-squares statistic larger than 80%. The marginal explanatory power of the openness and institutional variables, nonetheless, seems low.

In the remaining part of this sub-section, we explore two additional features that could shed some further insight about China's capital flight.

Historically, capital flight appears to be a more prominent phenomenon in developing than in developed economies. To be sure developed economies experience capital flight – but it is usually associated with, say, money laundering that allows criminals to transfer gains from illegal activities including drug dealing and tax evasion. Besides money laundering, capital flight

[15] See, for example, Prasad and Wei (2007) and Hung (2008) for China's capital control policy.

in developing economies is designated to circumvent capital controls, and to benefit favourable economic and political climates in overseas markets. Thus, the illicit capital movement in developing economies would be biased towards *outward* instead of *inward* capital flight.[16] In view of this, we anticipate China's capital flight could display asymmetric responses to positive and negative covered returns on RMB.

Table 2: Empirical Capital Flight Equations – Asymmetric CID effects

	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.909***	0.931***	0.897***	0.925***	0.926***	0.913***
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
CID(+,-3)	-0.005	-0.007	-0.009	-0.007	-0.008	-0.011
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
CID(-,-3)	-0.036***	-0.029	-0.024*	-0.032**	-0.041***	-0.020
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)
dOPENNESS	0.520**	0.570**	0.491**	0.574**	0.615**	0.503*
	(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Ex_Reform		0.005				0.018
		(0.03)				(0.03)
SED			0.024*			0.029*
			(0.01)			(0.02)
RISK				0.000		0.000
				(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL					0.011	0.012
					(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	-0.002**	-0.002**	-0.002**	-0.002	-0.004*	-0.004*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	0.030**	0.034**	0.037**	0.031	0.055*	0.062
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.15)	(0.03)	(0.16)
Adj. R-squares	0.88	0.87	0.88	0.87	0.87	0.87
Obs.	35	35	35	35	35	35
Q-stat(4)	6.28	6.29	7.08	5.80	6.21	7.04
Q-stat(8)	8.34	9.55	10.66	7.47	7.12	9.82

Note: The table reports the results of estimating equations (1), (2) and (3) with the CID variable replaced by its positive and negative components. See the Note to Table 1.

[16] China's data on *outward* and *inward* capital flight could be distorted by capital round-tripping, which refers to transferring capital illicitly out of China and then investing it back in the country via, say, Hong Kong, in order to take advantage of preferential tax concessions offered to foreign capital. See, for example, Tseng and Zebregs (2002) and World Bank (2002).

We define the variables $CID_t^+ \equiv \max[CID_t, 0]$ and $CID_t^- \equiv \min[CID_t, 0]$ and use them to assess the asymmetric response of China's capital flight to covered interest differentials. The results of estimating equations (1), (2), and (3), with CID_t replaced by CID_t^+ and CID_t^-, are presented in Table 2. The coefficient estimates of CID_t^- are larger in magnitude than the corresponding ones of CID_t^+ and, with two exceptions, are statistically significant. In essence, the results indicate that a negative covered return on RMB has a stronger impact on capital flight than a positive covered return.

Comparing Tables 1 and 2, the use of CID_t^+ and CID_t^- instead of CID_t does not lead to substantial changes in the coefficient estimates of the lagged capital flight and openness variables. The noticeable change in institutional factor effects is that the SED variable becomes the only significant institutional variable.

The second additional feature is related to the role of expected RMB valuation. Discussions of capital flight routinely refer to the role of currency speculation. Theoretically, the currency speculation effect should be accounted for by the covered return differential variable which is the sum of an interest differential component and an expected RMB depreciation component given by a RMB premium. However, one may argue that the use of covered interest parity deviation may not be relevant because the Chinese money market is not readily accessible to everyone. Further, in the early 2000s, it is perceived that speculation on RMB revaluation was a main factor driving capital movements. China's capital flight could, thus, respond differently to interest differentials and RMB expectations.

To investigate the individual roles of its components, we re-estimate equations (1), (2), and (3) with CID_t replaced by $RDIFF_t$ and $PREM_t$, where $RDIFF_t$ is the three-month RMB interbank offer rate minus the three-month US$ London interbank offer rate and $PREM_t$ is the three-month RMB premium derived from off-shore non-deliverable forward and spot rates. The off-shore non-deliverable RMB forwards are not (officially) subject to China's jurisdiction and, thus, could be viewed as a market indicator of expected currency movement. Table 3 presents the estimation results.

Both $RDIFF_t$ and $PREM_t$ garner a negative coefficient estimates, indicating capital flight is discouraged by either a favourable interest rate differential or exchange rate premium. For each specification, the coefficient estimate of the $PREM_t$ variable is much larger (in magnitude)

than that of $RDIFF_t$. Nevertheless, $PREM_t$ is insignificant in all the cases presented in the Table. $RDIFF_t$, on the other hand, is significant in the absence of institutional factors and significant in three out of five other cases. Contrary to the hyped RMB revaluation effect in the early 2000s, the covered interest differential effect on quarterly capital flight is mainly driven by the interest differential $RDIFF_t$ variable.

Table 3. Empirical Capital Flight Equations – Interest Rate and Forward Premium Effects

	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.949***	0.973***	0.902***	0.938***	0.955***	0.921***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)
PREM(-1)	-0.015	-0.013	-0.014	-0.020	-0.020	-0.012
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
RDIFF(-1)	-0.005**	-0.002*	-0.004**	-0.003*	-0.003	-0.002
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
dOPENNESS	0.456**	0.432*	0.333	0.445**	0.447**	0.329
	(0.20)	(0.23)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.22)
Ex_R		0.030***				0.023**
		(0.01)				(0.01)
SED			0.033**			0.029
			(0.02)			(0.02)
RISK				-0.003**		-0.001
				(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL					-0.012	0.004
					(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.000
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	-0.009	0.002	0.000	0.197*	-0.026	0.066
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.10)	(0.02)	(0.15)
Adj. R-squares	0.86	0.88	0.89	0.87	0.87	0.89
Obs.	37	37	37	37	37	37
Q-stat(4)	2.10	5.06	2.31	3.56	2.59	5.26
Q-stat(8)	5.69	6.56	7.15	9.17	6.86	8.72

Note: The table reports the results of estimating equations (1), (2) and (3) with the CID variable replaced by its interest rate differential and forward premium components. See the Note to Table 1.

Table 4: Empirical Capital Flight Equations – Combined Specifications

	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.961***	0.974***	0.902***	0.940***	0.955***	0.914***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)
PREM(+,-1)	-0.011	-0.014	-0.014	-0.020	-0.023	-0.020
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
PREM(-,-1)	-0.025	-0.007	-0.011	-0.018	-0.014	0.007
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
RDIFF(+,-1)	-0.009**	-0.006**	-0.009**	-0.007	-0.007	-0.006**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)
RDIFF(-,-1)	-0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.003
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
dOPENNESS	0.474**	0.458*	0.360	0.470**	0.479**	0.358
	(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.25)
Ex_R		0.032**				0.027**
		(0.01)				(0.01)
SED			0.035*			0.032
			(0.02)			(0.02)
RISK				-0.003*		0.000
				(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL					-0.016	-0.004
					(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.002	0.000
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	-0.006	0.011	0.010	0.203*	-0.021	0.042
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.12)	(0.03)	(0.15)
Adj. R-squares	0.86	0.87	0.89	0.87	0.86	0.89
Obs.	37	37	37	37	37	37
Q-stat(4)	5.27	6.18	4.07	5.14	4.39	6.93
Q-stat(8)	9.94	7.59	10.44	11.05	9.00	13.15

Note: The table reports the results of estimating equations (1), (2) and (3) with the CID variable replaced by the positive and negative interest rate differential and forward premium components. See the Note to Table 1.

Table 4 presents the results of estimating model specifications that allow for asymmetric responses to positive and negative interest differentials and forward premiums, where $RDIFF_t^+ \equiv \max[RDIFF_t, 0]$, $RDIFF_t^- \equiv \min[RDIFF_t, 0]$, $PREM_t^+ \equiv \max[PREM_t, 0]$, and $PREM_t^- \equiv \min[PREM_t, 0]$.

Similar to Table 3, the coefficient estimates of $PREM_t^+$ and $PREM_t^-$ are typically larger (in magnitude) than the corresponding coefficient estimates of $RDIFF_t^+$ and $RDIFF_t^-$. Among the four components of covered interest differential, it is $RDIFF_t^+$ that has a significant coefficient estimate in the absence of institutional factors and is significant in three out of five other cases. That is, when the Chinese interest rate is higher than the corresponding US rate, there is a slowdown in capital flight. The result, however, is different from the one in Table 2, which indicates a statistically significant change in capital flight occurs when China experiences a negative covered return differential.

A few observations from Tables 1 to 4 are in order. First, the capital flight variable displays considerable persistence. Second, trade openness is the main economic variable that has a statistically significant implication for capital flight. Third, the significance of selected institutional factors depends on specification. Fourth, the adjusted R-squares estimates show that the selected macroeconomic and institutional regressors offer some marginal explanatory power. The incremental improvement is, however, quite limited as these estimates are typically in the range of 83% to 89%. Fifth, the covered return differential variable is in most cases significant only with a lag of three quarters. On the other hand, its components; namely the interest differential and RMB premium, affect capital flight with only a one quarter lag. The concern is, of course, how long does it take to move capital in and out the country. The capital flight is also found to respond asymmetrically to covered interest differentials and their components.

3.3 Monthly data

Most studies on capital flight rely on quarterly data that are typically retrieved from the balance of payments statistics. Depending on its speed of adjustment to changes in political and economic conditions, capital flight's reactions to its determinants might not be accurately revealed using quarterly data. Higher frequency data, say, monthly data, could offer a finer grid to gauge the information about capital flight behavior and better capture the interaction between capital flight and its determinants. In our exercise, monthly data are not available only for the capital flight and GDP variables. Thus, if we could construct monthly capital flight and GDP data from their quarterly counterparts and re-estimate various capital flight regression equations, we could have an alternative perspective on China's capital flight behavior.

The method detailed in Chow and Lin (1971) is used to interpolate monthly data from the corresponding quarterly ones. Essentially, information from monthly data on comparable and related variables is used to obtain the monthly capital flight and GDP data from the corresponding quarterly data. Wilcox (1983), for example, reports that the Chow and Lin method can successfully recover the essential dynamic characteristics of a data series, including autocorrelation structure and turning points. The data construction procedure is described in the Appendix. The constructed monthly capital flight and GDP data and other monthly data series were then used to study capital flight behavior. The results of using the monthly data to re-estimate capital flight equations are reported in Tables 5 to 8, which are presented in a format similar to Tables 1 to 4.

There are a few differences between the monthly and quarterly results. First, the sum of lagged capital flight coefficient estimates obtained from the monthly data is smaller than the corresponding one from the quarterly data. One possible interpretation is that the estimated persistence of monthly capital flight is lower than the one of quarterly data. It is noted that quarterly capital flight displays a single lag structure while two lagged capital flight variables are significant in the case of monthly data. Thus, it is likely that, in this case, quarterly data are too coarse to reveal temporal interactions and they over-state persistence.

Second, the responses of monthly capital flight to the cover interest differential and its related variables are different from those of quarterly capital flight. In Tables 5 to 8, the covered interest differential variable, CID_t, and its derivatives including CID_t^+, CID_t^-, $RDIFF_t$, $PREM_t$, $RDIFF_t^+$, $RDIFF_t^-$, $PREM_t^+$, and $PREM_t^-$ are found to significantly affect capital flight with a one-month time lag. In a world when capital could move via various channels including electronic means, a response rate of one month appears not unlikely. For quarterly data, the effect of the covered interest differential variable and its derivatives is significant with a one-quarter or a three-quarter lag; a response lag that seems a bit long in the context of the modern capital market.

Besides the response time, there are other discernable differences. In Table 5, the monthly overall covered interest differential effect given by CID_t is negative and is significant in only three of the seven cases. Nonetheless, these monthly estimates are in general larger (in magnitude) than the corresponding ones in Table 1.

Table 5. Empirical Capital Flight Equations, Monthly data

	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.569***	0.536***	0.532***	0.536***	0.536***	0.532***	0.526***
	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
F(-2)	0.296***	0.342***	0.337***	0.341***	0.342***	0.340***	0.333***
	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)
CID(-1)	-0.029*	-0.024	-0.031*	-0.024	-0.025	-0.028	-0.031*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
dIR(-1)		-0.191*	-0.196***	-0.193*	-0.191*	-0.195*	-0.207*
		(0.10)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)
Ex_R			-0.010				-0.009
			(0.01)				(0.02)
SED				0.003			0.006
				(0.01)			(0.01)
RISK					0.000		-0.001
					(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL						0.005	0.008
						(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	0.000	0.000*	0.001*	0.000*	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	-0.001	0.000	-0.006	0.000	-0.014	0.004	0.087
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.09)	(0.02)	(0.13)
Adj.R-squares	0.67	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.68
Obs.	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
Q-stat(12)	10.72	17.72	17.62	18.21	17.44	16.72	17.74
Q-stat(24)	26.17	23.01	23.01	23.35	22.65	21.69	23.81

Note: The table reports the results of using monthly data to estimate equations (1), (2) and (3). See the Note to Table 1 for detail.

Table 6. Empirical Capital Flight Equations – Asymmetric CID effects, Monthly Data

	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.505***	0.505***	0.506***	0.500***	0.504***	0.498***
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
F(-2)	0.321***	0.320***	0.316***	0.318***	0.319***	0.309***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
CID(+,-1)	-0.046***	-0.047***	-0.047***	-0.044***	-0.045***	-0.050***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
CID(-,-1)	0.022	0.019	0.025	0.034	0.034	0.031
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
dIR(-1)	-0.182*	-0.184*	-0.187*	-0.182*	-0.176*	-0.189*
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Ex_R		-0.003				-0.011
		(0.01)				(0.01)
SED			0.010			0.009
			(0.01)			(0.01)
RISK				-0.001		-0.001
				(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL					-0.005	-0.003
					(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	0.018	0.016	0.020	0.104	0.017	0.094
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.08)	(0.02)	(0.12)
Adj.R-squares	0.71	0.70	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.70
Obs.	112	112	112	112	112	112
Q-stat(12)	17.47	16.99	17.02	18.20	18.08	17.85
Q-stat(24)	22.46	21.58	23.23	23.17	22.85	26.04

Note: The table reports the results of using monthly data to estimate equations (1), (2) and (3) with the CID variable replaced by its positive and negative components. See the Note to Table 2.

Table 7. Empirical Capital Flight Equations – Interest Rate and Forward Premium Effects, Monthly data

	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.531***	0.532***	0.532***	0.528***	0.533***	0.527***
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
F(-2)	0.318***	0.318***	0.316***	0.312***	0.316***	0.311***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
PREM(-1)	-0.234**	-0.231**	-0.234**	-0.242**	-0.241**	-0.240**
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
RDIFF(-1)	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
dIR(-1)	-0.191*	-0.190*	-0.193*	-0.193*	-0.188*	-0.196*
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)
Ex_R		0.000				-0.001
		(0.03)				(0.01)
SED			0.004			0.002
			(0.01)			(0.01)
RISK				-0.002		-0.002
				(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL					-0.003	0.002
					(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	0.001**	0.001**	0.001**	0.001**	0.001*	0.001*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	0.094	-0.008	0.114
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.09)	(0.02)	(0.13)
Adj.R-squares	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.69
Obs.	112	112	112	112	112	112
Q-stat(12)	15.39	15.52	16.22	16.39	15.69	16.70
Q-stat(24)	19.74	19.87	20.37	20.88	20.09	21.10

Note: The table reports the results of using monthly data to estimate equations (1), (2) and (3) with the CID variable replaced by its interest rate differential and forward premium components. See the Note to Table 3.

Table 8. Empirical Capital Flight Equations – Combined Specifications, Monthly Data

	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
F(-1)	0.505***	0.504***	0.505***	0.495***	0.505***	0.496***
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.14)
F(-2)	0.292***	0.291***	0.287***	0.278***	0.283***	0.275***
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
PREM(+,-1)	-0.286***	-0.278***	-0.289***	-0.298***	-0.308***	-0.298***
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.09)
PREM(-,-1)	0.170	0.231	0.188	0.225	0.214	0.280
	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.18)
RDIFF(+,1)	-0.007	-0.005	-0.007	-0.002	-0.005	-0.001
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
RDIFF(-,-1)	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.003
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
dIR(-1)	-0.176*	-0.168*	-0.181*	-0.175*	-0.165*	-0.168*
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Ex_R		0.012				0.009
		(0.01)				(0.01)
SED			0.010			0.005
			(0.01)			(0.01)
RISK				-0.003*		-0.002
				(0.00)		(0.00)
CONTROL					-0.009	-0.003
					(0.01)	(0.01)
Trend	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001*	0.001*	0.000
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	0.020	0.027	0.021	0.180*	0.012	0.151
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.09)	(0.02)	(0.13)
Adj.R-squares	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71
Obs.	112	112	112	112	112	112
Q-stat(12)	15.74	14.98	17.30	16.50	16.46	16.96
Q-stat(24)	20.49	19.77	21.78	21.81	21.69	22.23

Note: The table reports the results of using monthly data to estimate equations (1), (2) and (3) with the CID variable replaced by the positive and negative interest rate differential and forward premium components. See the Note to Table 4.

Monthly capital flight, similar to quarterly capital flight, responds asymmetrically to positive and negative covered interest differentials. However, monthly capital flight is found to respond to positive, but not negative, covered interest differentials in a statistically significant

manner. That is, when the covered interest is in favour of Chinese RMB, there is a slowdown or even a reverse of outward capital flight. This result is in sharp contrast to the finding in Table 2 that quarterly capital flight is significantly affected by negative, instead of positive, covered interest differentials. Apparently, the monthly results are in line with the media hype about the hot money flows to China in anticipation of RMB appreciation and dramatic growth opportunities.

The monthly interest differential and RMB premium effects are also different from those reported for quarterly data. In Table 7, it is clear that the covered interest differential effect is mainly driven by the premium component. The coefficient estimates of $PREM_t$ are significant and larger (in magnitude) than those of CID_t in Table 5 while $RDIFF_t$ has small and insignificant estimates. Again, the finding derived from monthly data, instead of quarterly data, lends support to the anecdotes that are quite common in the media on hot money influx triggered by, among other factors, expected RMB appreciation.

The asymmetric effects presented in Table 8 are in accordance with the results in Table 6 and 7; namely, it is mainly the positive return to RMB holdings given by non-delivery forward premiums that has a significant impact on monthly capital flight. These results reinforce the finding that the monthly and quarterly capital flight data reveal different sources of the covered interest differential effect.

Comparing the results in Tables 5 and 8, we note that the effects of the covered interest differential and its related variables on monthly capital flight data are quite consistent across the specifications under consideration. The estimated covered interest differential effect is negative and is driven by returns in favor of RMB. Further it is the premium component rather than the interest differential component that affects capital flight.

The quarterly data, on the other hand, give some conflicting messages about the covered interest differential effect. For instance, the response time shifts from one quarter to three quarters when a macroeconomic variable is introduced (see columns (2) and (3) in Table 1), and then reverts back to one quarter when its components $RDIFF_t$ and $PREM_t$ are considered (see Tables 3 and 4). Further the quarterly results are ambiguous on whether the capital flight is affected by positive or negative covered interest differentials – results in Table 2 are suggestive of negative ones while those in Table 4 are indicative of positive ones. One possible explanation of imprecision is that the number of quarterly observations is quite small. Another possible

explanation is that the ambiguity arises because the quarterly frequency may be too coarse to fully capture the adjustment mechanism that could have taken place in less than three months.

On balance, the monthly covered interest differential effects are more intuitive and appealing than the quarterly ones. A caveat is that the monthly capital flight data are derived (interpolated) from the quarterly data. Even though established standard statistical procedures are used to construct the data, there is no guarantee that these monthly data represent the true, but unobservable, underlying monthly capital flight dynamics. Thus, we should interpret these results with caution.

Third, in the case of monthly data, the only statistically significant macroeconomic variable is, dIR, the international reserve variable. Specifically, an increase in international reserves (per GDP) deters capital flight. An increase in China's international reserves is typically associated with an increase in trade surplus and an increase in the economic and political pressures on RMB appreciation – these two factors are perceived to curb capital flight. The interesting observation is that the international reserve variable is significant in the presence of RMB premiums, other macroeconomic variables, and the selected institutional factors.

Fourth, with one exception, the four selected institutional factors are insignificant; either when they were included in the regression one at a time or as a group. The only significant case is given by the RISK variable in Table 8 with a negative coefficient estimate indicating a low level of political risk implies a low level of capital flight.

4. Concluding Remarks

We study the empirical determinants of China's capital flight. In addition to the key covered interest differential variable, our empirical exercise includes macroeconomic economic variables that are commonly considered in the literature and a few institutional factors. The results on covered interest differential effect are largely in accordance with the conventional wisdom – a favorable covered interest differential deters capital flight. Our exercise, nonetheless, shows that the specifics of the covered interest differential effect depend on whether monthly or quarterly data are considered. The monthly data, compared with quarterly data, offer results that are quite consistent across specifications examined and in line with the media anecdotes on capital flight and expected RMB appreciation.

One result we do not expect is the limited impact of standard macroeconomic factors. Among a rather exhaustive list of macroeconomic variables, we only identify a few that are significant in China's capital flight regressions. Specifically, quarterly capital flight data are significantly affected by a trade openness variable while monthly capital flight is significantly affected by an international reserve variable. The relevance of the selected institutional factors depends on both data frequency and regression specification. In general, the selected institutional factors do not offer a substantial marginal explanatory power even when they are significant; indeed, they are insignificant in most of the monthly specifications.

Overall, our regression exercise shows that China's capital flight – both at the quarterly or monthly frequency – is quite well explained by its own history and covered interest differentials. The other possible determinants offer relatively small incremental explanatory power. Our estimation results highlight the role of data frequency – different data frequencies could have some significant implications for the empirical capital flight behavior. For the current exercise, we consider the monthly results more intuitive than the quarterly ones.

It is believed that capital flight could adversely affect China's economy by diverting the needed resources and reducing the effectiveness of monetary and exchange rate policies. It also has implications for China's approach of further liberalizing capital management policy. With its proclaimed gradualism approach to economic reform, we do not expect China to implement dramatic measures in a fast pace to curtail capital controls and open up its capital account. Thus, we expect capital flight, even in the presence of official controls, will display its persistence in the near future.

Gradual policy changes, however, would reduce the need for moving capital around in an illicit manner. For instance, on July 13, 2009, the China's State Administration of Foreign Exchange issued new rules that make it easier for both Chinese and foreign corporations to move foreign exchanges to overseas. The change is part of China's continuing efforts to liberalize foreign exchange controls. We anticipate that these changes in control measures, even they occur slowly, will remove some of the motivations behind the current capital flight and, thus, reduce its magnitude and economic impacts.

Appendix A: Data - Definition and Sources

F	The stock of China's capital flight in trillion US$. The US dollar LIBORs are used to compound capital flight data and the compounded series is adjusted by the US inflation rates. The World Bank residual method is used to construct the capital flight data. The required balance of payments data are obtained from the State Administration of Foreign Exchange (SAFE) of China.
CID	The covered interest differential. It is given by (1+r) – (F/S)(1+r*), where r is the Chinese interbank offer rate (CHIBOR), r* is the US$ LIBOR, F is the renminbi non-deliverable forward rate (yuan/$); and S is the spot exchange rate (yuan/$). For the quarterly data exercise, CHIBOR, LIBOR, and F are 3-month rates. For the monthly data exercise, they are 1-month rates. Data are retrieved from CEIC.
RGDPG	China's real GDP growth rate calculated from seasonal adjusted data from CEIC.
FISC	China's government deficit scaled by GDP. (Data source: CEIC)
dIR	China's international reserve changes scaled by GDP. (Data source: CEIC)
REAL	The return of China's index of real estate investment. (Data source: CEIC)
dOPENNESS	The change of China's trade openness scaled by GDP. The openness is given by the sum of seasonally adjusted imports and exports (Data source: CEIC)
INFL	The difference between the Chinese and US inflation rates. (Data source: CEIC)
Ex_R	A dummy variable for China's July, 2005 exchange rate policy reform, I(t>=July, 2005).
SED	A dummy variable for the semi-yearly Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED) between the US and Chinese Governments, starting from Dec. 2006. The variable is set equal to 1 in the month (quarter) when the SED takes place.
RISK	China's Political Risk Index - a higher value means a lower level of political risk. (Data Source: ICRG)
CONTROL	A dummy variable to capture the timing of China's capital control policy changes. It is assigned a value of -1 for the observations before Sept. 2001, when China tightened capital outflow; a value 0 for the observations between Sept. 2001 and Oct. 2002, when it is deemed as a transition period; and a value +1 for the observations after Oct. 2002, when Chinese authorities starts to encourage or promote capital outflow.
RDIFF	Interest rate differential. The data is calculated by subtracting the US$ LIBOR from CHIBOR.
PREM	The renminbi non-deliverable forward premium given by, $(NDF_{t+k} - e_t) / e_t$, where NDF_t and e_t are, respectively, non-deliverable forward and spot rates expressed as the price of renminbi. The 90-day and 30-day forwards are used in, respectively, quarterly and monthly data regressions.
Trend	A time trend variable.

Note: The change of a variable is used when it itself is I(1).

Appendix B: Measuring Capital Flight

Various measures of capital flight are introduced in the literature. In this Appendix, we briefly discuss three commonly used measures.

1. The World Bank residual measure, World Bank (1985)

The measure compares the sources of the funds and the uses of funds reported in a country's balance of payments statistics. If all fund movements are recorded appropriately, the double-entry accounting practice should ensure that the uses of funds equal the sources of funds.

The World Bank residual method, thus, defines capital flight as

$$Capital\ flight = \Delta ExD + NFDI - CAD - \Delta IR,$$

where ΔExD is the change in external debts, *NFDI* is the net foreign direct investment; *CAD* is the current account deficit, and ΔIR is the change in international reserves. There is outward (inward) capital flight when the recorded sources of funds given by increases in external debts and net FDI inflow are larger (less) than the recorded uses of funds given by current account deficit and international reserve accumulation. Note that this measure of capital flight incorporates all foreign assets and liabilities incurred by both public and private sectors.

2. The private claim measure, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company (1986) and Conesa (1986)

In essence, the measure assumes the banking system is not involved in capital flight activity. It could be written as

$$Capital\ flight_{\text{private claim}} = \Delta ExD + NFDI - CAD - \Delta IR - stBFA$$

where *stBFA* is the short-term foreign assets in the banking system. By excluding foreign assets in the banking sector, the measure focuses on the non-bank private sector behavior.

3. The "hot money" measure, Cuddington (1986)

The measure emphasizes the role short-term capital in defining capital flight. It is given by

$$Capital\ flight_{\text{hot money}} = stNB + E\ \&\ O$$

where *stNB* is the non-bank private short-term capital outflow and $E \& O$ is the errors and omissions entry reported in the balance of payments account. The errors and omissions term is a common measure of unrecorded capital movement.

Most of the other capital flight measures are variants of one of these three measures. One major type of variants incorporates trade mis-invoicing. For more detailed discussions of various measures of capital flight and their limitations, see, for example, Claessens and Naudé (1993), Deppler and Williamson (1987), Dooley (1986), Kant (1986), and Kar and Cartwright-Smith (2008).

Appendix C: Constructing the monthly capital flight and GDP data

In the text, we use the Chow and Lin (1971) method, which is built upon Chang and Liu (1951), to extract the information to construct monthly capital flight and GDP data. For example, to construct the monthly GDP series, the Chow and Lin method uses information on variables that are closely related to GDP and, at the same time, available on the monthly frequency. Usually, these monthly variables are components of GDP. Wilcox (1983), for example, reports that the Chow and Lin method can successfully recover the essential dynamic characteristics of a data series, including autocorrelation structure and turning points.

The residual method based capital flight is given by

$$Capital\ flight = \Delta ExD + NFDI - CAD - \Delta IR.$$

Monthly data on international reserves are available. Thus, we have to construct the monthly data on CAD, $NFDI$, and ΔExD. In our exercise, data on China's trade balance are used to derive the monthly current account balance. The net FDI series is derived using data on inward FDI. The monthly external debt series is derived from the regression framework given in Eaton and Gersovitz (1981) with a dummy variable capturing China's Qualified Foreign Institutional Investor program that was instituted in 2002 and allows designated foreign entities to participate in the local Chinese stock markets.

For the GDP data, only data on the aggregate consumption component are not available at the monthly frequency. Thus, we derived monthly consumption data using information on monthly retail sales on consumer goods, and the consumption of transportation and telecommunication services (Chang and Liu, 1951).

References:

Aliber, Robert Z., 1973, "The Interest Rate Parity Theorem: A Reinterpretation," *The Journal of Political Economy* 81, 1451-59.

Boyce, James K., 1992, "The Revolving Door? External Debt and Capital Flight: a Philippine Case Study," *World Development* 20, 335–349.

Boyce, James and Leonce Ndikumana, 2001, "Is Africa a Net Debtor? New Estimates of Capital Flight from Severely Indebted Sub-Saharan African Countries, 1970-98," *Journal of Development Studies* 38, 27-56.

Blanchard, Olivier and Francesco Giavazz, 2006, "Rebalancing Growth in China: A Three-Handed Approach," *China & World Economy* 14, 1-20.

Chang, Ching-Gwan, and Ta-Chung Liu, 1951, "Monthly Estimates of Certain National Product Components, 1946-49," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 33, 219-227.

Cheung, Yin-Wong and Kon S. Lai, 1993, "Finite-Sample Sizes of Johansen's Likelihood Ration Tests for Conintegration," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 55, 313-28.

Cheung, Yin-Wong and Kon S. Lai, 1995, "Lag Order and Critical Values of a Modified Dickey-Fuller Test," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 57, 411-419.

Cheung, Yin-Wong, Menzie D. Chinn, and Eiji Fujii, 2003, "China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan: A quantitative assessment of real and financial integration," *China Economic Review* 14, 281-303.

Cheung, Yin-Wong, Menzie Chinn, and Eiji Fujii, 2007a, *The Economic Integration of Greater China: Real and Financial Linkages and the Prospects for Currency Union,* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Cheung, Yin-Wong, Menzie Chinn, and Eiji Fujii, 2007b, "The Overvaluation of Renminbi Undervaluation," *Journal of International Money and Finance* 26, 762–85.

Cheung, Yin-Wong, and Xingwang Qian, 2009, "Empirics of China's Outward Direct Investment," *Pacific Economic Review* 14, 312-341.

Chow, Gregory C. and An-loh Lin, 1971, "Best Linear Unbiased Interpolation, Distribution, and Extrapolation of Time Series by Related Series," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 53, 372-375.

Claessens, Stijn and David Naude, 1993, "Recent Estimates of Capital Flight," *Policy Research Working* Paper Series 1186, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Cline, William R., 1994, *International Debt Reexamined*, Washington D.C., Institute for International Economics.

Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler and Catherine A. Pattillo, 1999, "Flight Capital as a Portfolio Choice," *IMF Working Paper* No. 99/171.

Conesa, Eduardo, 1986, "The Causes of Capital Flight from Latin America, 1970–85," mimeo, Inter-American Development Bank.

Cuddington, John, 1986, "Capital Flight: Estimates, Issues, and Explanations," *Princeton Studies in International Finance*, No. 58.

Cuddington, John, 1987, "Capital Flight," *European Economic Review* 31, 382-8.

Deppler, Michael and John Williamson, 1987, "Capital Flight: Concepts, Measurement and Issues," *IMF Staff Studies for the World Economic Outlook*, August, IMF, Washington, D.C.

Diwan, Ishac, 1989, "Foreign Debt, Crowding Out and Capital Flight," *Journal of International money and Finance* 8, 121- 136.

Dooley, Michael P., 1986, "Country-specific Risk Premiums, Capital Flight and Net Investment Income Payments in Selected Developing Countries," *IMF Departmental memorandum* DM/86/17.

Dooley, Michael P., 1988, "Capital flight: A Response to Differences in Financial Risks," *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers* 35, 423–36.

Dooley, Michael P., William Helkie, Ralph Tryon and John Underwood, 1986, "An Analysis of External Debt Positions of Eight Developing Countries Through 1990," *Journal of Development Economics* 21, 283-318.

Dooley, Michael and Peter Isard, 1980, "Capital Controls, Political Risk, and Deviations from Interest-Rate Parity," *Journal of Political Economy* 88, 370-84.

Dornbusch, Rudiger, 1984, "External Debt, Budget Deficits and Disequilibrium Exchange Rates," NBER Working Papers, No. 1336.

Eaton, Jonathan and Mark Gersovitz, 1981, "Debt with Potential Repudiation: Theoretical and Empirical Analysis," *The Review of Economic Studies* 48, 289-309.

Eichengreen, Barry and Hui Tong, 2007, "Is China's FDI Coming at the Expense of Other Countries?" *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 21, 153–172.

Elliott, Graham, Thomas J. Rothenberg and James H. Stock, 1996, "Efficient Tests for an Autoregressive Unit Root," *Econometrica* 64, 813-836.

Feenstra, Robert and Shang-Jin Wei, 2009, "Introduction to China's Growing Role in World Trade," *NBER Working Paper*, NO.14716.

Frankel, Jeffrey and Charles M. Engel, 1984. "Do Asset-demand Functions Optimize over the Mean and Variance of Real Returns? A Six-currency Test," *Journal of International Economics* 17, 309-323.

Gibson, Heather D. and Euclid Tsakalotos, 1993, "Testing a Flow Model of Capital Flight in Five European Countries," *The Manchester School* 61, 144–68.

Gunter, Frank R., 1996, "Capital flight from the People's Republic of China: 1984–1994," *China Economic Review* 7, 77– 96.

Gunter, Frank R., 2004, "Capital flight from China: 1984–2001," *China Economic Review* 15, 63– 85.

Hale, Galina and Cheryl Long, forthcoming, "Are There Productivity Spillovers from Foreign Direct Investment in China?" *Pacific Economic Review*.

Harrigan, Jane, George Mavrotas, and Zulkornain Yusop, 2002, "On the Determinants of Capital Flight: A New Approach," *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy* 7, 203-241.

Hermes Niels, Robert Lensink, and Victor Murinde, 2002, "Flight Capital and its Reversal for Development Financing," *UNU/WIDER Discussion Paper* No. 2002/99, United Nations.

Hung, Juann H., 2008, "China's Approach to Capital Flows Since 1978: A Brief Overview," in Yin-Wong Cheung, Kar-Yiu Wong, editors, *China and Asia: Economic and Financial Interactions*, 44-63, New York: Rutledge.

Jeanne, Olivier, 2007, "International Reserves in Emerging Market Countries: Too Much of a Good Thing?" 1-55, in William C. Brainard and George L. Perry, editors, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1, Brookings Institution Press.

Kant, Chander, 1996, "Foreign Direct Investment and Capital Flight," *Princeton Studies in International Finance*, No. 80, April.

Kant, Chandler, 2002, "What is Capital Flight?" *The World Economy* 25, 341-358.

Kar, Dev and Devon Cartwright-Smith, 2008, "Illicit Financial Flows from Developing Countries: 2002-2006," Global Financial Integrity, Washington, D.C.

Khan, Mohsin and Nadeem Haque, 1987, "Capital Flight from Developing Countries," *Finance and Development* 7, 29–37.

Lane, Philip R. and Sergio L. Schmukler, 2007, "The International Financial Integration of China and India," *Policy Research Working Paper Series* 4132, the World Bank.

Lessard, Donald and John Williamson, 1987, "Capital Flight and the Third World Debt," Washington, DC: Institute of International Economics.

Ljungwall, Christer and Zijian Wang, 2008, "Why Is Capital Flowing Out of China?" *China Economic Review* 19, 359–372.

Ma, Guonan, Corrinne Ho, and Robert, N. McCauley, 2004, "The Markets for Non-deliverable Forwards in Asian Currencies," *BIS Quarterly Review* June, 81-94.

Ma, Guonan and Robert N. McCauley, 2008, "The Efficacy of China's Capital Controls – Evidence from Price and Flow Data," *Pacific Economic Review* 13, 104-23.

Mikkelsen, Jan G., 1991, "An Econometric Investigation of Capital Flight," *Applied Economics* 23, 73-85.

Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, 1986, "LDC's Capital Flight," World Financial Market, February.

Obstfeld, Maurice, 2006, "The Renminbi's Dollar Peg at the Crossroads," Center for International and Development Economics Research, Working Paper Series 1066, Institute for Business and Economic Research, UC Berkeley.

Prasad, Eswar and Shang-Jin Wei, 2007, "China's Approach to Capital Inflows: Patterns and Possible Explanations," 421-480, in Sebastian Edwards, editor, *Capital Controls and Capital Flows in Emerging Economies: Policies, Practices and Consequences*, Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Pastor, Manuel, 1990, "Capital Flight and the Latin American Debt Crisis," Washington DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Rodrik, Dani, 2006, "What's so Special About China's Exports?" *NBER Working Paper*, No. 11947.

Rojas-Suarez, Liliana, 1990, "Risk and Capital Flight in Developing Countries," *IMF working paper*, WP/90/64.

Schineller, Lisa, 1997, "An Econometric Model of Capital Flight from Developing Countries," *Discussion Paper* No 579, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC.

Sicular, Terry, 1998, "Capital Flight and Foreign Investment: Two Tales from China and Russia," *The World Economy* 21, 589–602.

Smit, B. W. and B. A. Mocke, 1991, "Capital Flight from South Africa: Magnitude and Causes," *South African Journal of Economics* 59, 101–17.

Tseng, Wanda and Harm Zebregs, 2002, "Foreign Direct Investment in China: Some Lessons for Other Countries," *IMF Policy Discussion Paper* NO. 02/03. Washington DC.

Wilcox, James A., 1983, "Disaggregating Data Using Related Series," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 1, 187–91.

World Bank (1985) *World Bank Report*, Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank, 2002, "Box 2.3: Round-tripping of Capital Flows between China and Hong Kong," *Global Development Finance 2002*, Chapter 2, 41.

Wu, Friedrich and Leslie Tang, 2000, "China's Capital Flight, 1990– 1999: Estimates and Implications," *Review of Pacific Basin Financial Markets and Policies* 3, 59–75.

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp
(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

2869 Alberto Asquer, On the many Ways Europeanization Matters: The Implementation of the Water Reform in Italy (1994-2006), December 2009

2870 Choudhry Tanveer Shehzad and Jakob De Haan, Financial Reform and Banking Crises, December 2009

2871 Annette Alstadsæter and Hans Henrik Sievertsen, The Consumption Value of Higher Education, December 2009

2872 Chris van Klaveren, Bernard van Praag and Henriette Maassen van den Brink, Collective Labor Supply of Native Dutch and Immigrant Households in the Netherlands, December 2009

2873 Burkhard Heer and Alfred Maußner, Computation of Business-Cycle Models with the Generalized Schur Method, December 2009

2874 Carlo Carraro, Enrica De Cian and Massimo Tavoni, Human Capital Formation and Global Warming Mitigation: Evidence from an Integrated Assessment Model, December 2009

2875 André Grimaud, Gilles Lafforgue and Bertrand Magné, Climate Change Mitigation Options and Directed Technical Change: A Decentralized Equilibrium Analysis, December 2009

2876 Angel de la Fuente, A Mixed Splicing Procedure for Economic Time Series, December 2009

2877 Martin Schlotter, Guido Schwerdt and Ludger Woessmann, Econometric Methods for Causal Evaluation of Education Policies and Practices: A Non-Technical Guide, December 2009

2878 Mathias Dolls, Clemens Fuest and Andreas Peichl, Automatic Stabilizers and Economic Crisis: US vs. Europe, December 2009

2879 Tom Karkinsky and Nadine Riedel, Corporate Taxation and the Choice of Patent Location within Multinational Firms, December 2009

2880 Kai A. Konrad, Florian Morath and Wieland Müller, Taxation and Market Power, December 2009

2881 Marko Koethenbuerger and Michael Stimmelmayr, Corporate Taxation and Corporate Governance, December 2009

2882 Gebhard Kirchgässner, The Lost Popularity Function: Are Unemployment and Inflation no longer Relevant for the Behaviour of Germany Voters?, December 2009

2883 Marianna Belloc and Ugo Pagano, Politics-Business Interaction Paths, December 2009

2884 Wolfgang Buchholz, Richard Cornes and Dirk Rübbelke, Existence and Warr Neutrality for Matching Equilibria in a Public Good Economy: An Aggregative Game Approach, December 2009

2885 Charles A.E. Goodhart, Carolina Osorio and Dimitrios P. Tsomocos, Analysis of Monetary Policy and Financial Stability: A New Paradigm, December 2009

2886 Thomas Aronsson and Erkki Koskela, Outsourcing, Public Input Provision and Policy Cooperation, December 2009

2887 Andreas Ortmann, "The Way in which an Experiment is Conducted is Unbelievably Important": On the Experimentation Practices of Economists and Psychologists, December 2009

2888 Andreas Irmen, Population Aging and the Direction of Technical Change, December 2009

2889 Wolf-Heimo Grieben and Fuat Şener, Labor Unions, Globalization, and Mercantilism, December 2009

2890 Conny Wunsch, Optimal Use of Labor Market Policies: The Role of Job Search Assistance, December 2009

2891 Claudia Buch, Cathérine Tahmee Koch and Michael Kötter, Margins of International Banking: Is there a Productivity Pecking Order in Banking, too?, December 2009

2892 Shafik Hebous and Alfons J. Weichenrieder, Debt Financing and Sharp Currency Depreciations: Wholly vs. Partially Owned Multinational Affiliates, December 2009

2893 Johannes Binswanger and Daniel Schunk, What is an Adequate Standard of Living during Retirement?, December 2009

2894 Armin Falk and James J. Heckman, Lab Experiments are a Major Source of Knowledge in the Social Sciences, December 2009

2895 Hartmut Egger and Daniel Etzel, The Impact of Trade on Employment, Welfare, and Income Distribution in Unionized General Oligopolistic Equilibrium, December 2009

2896 Julian Rauchdobler, Rupert Sausgruber and Jean-Robert Tyran, Voting on Thresholds for Public Goods: Experimental Evidence, December 2009

2897 Michael McBride and Stergios Skaperdas, Conflict, Settlement, and the Shadow of the Future, December 2009

2898 Ben J. Heijdra and Laurie S. M. Reijnders, Economic Growth and Longevity Risk with Adverse Selection, December 2009

2899 Johannes Becker, Taxation of Foreign Profits with Heterogeneous Multinational Firms, December 2009

2900 Douglas Gale and Piero Gottardi, Illiquidity and Under-Valuation of Firms, December 2009

2901 Donatella Gatti, Christophe Rault and Anne-Gaël Vaubourg, Unemployment and Finance: How do Financial and Labour Market Factors Interact?, December 2009

2902 Arno Riedl, Behavioral and Experimental Economics Can Inform Public Policy: Some Thoughts, December 2009

2903 Wilhelm K. Kohler and Marcel Smolka, Global Sourcing Decisions and Firm Productivity: Evidence from Spain, December 2009

2904 Marcel Gérard and Fernando M. M. Ruiz, Corporate Taxation and the Impact of Governance, Political and Economic Factors, December 2009

2905 Mikael Priks, The Effect of Surveillance Cameras on Crime: Evidence from the Stockholm Subway, December 2009

2906 Xavier Vives, Asset Auctions, Information, and Liquidity, January 2010

2907 Edwin van der Werf, Unilateral Climate Policy, Asymmetric Backstop Adoption, and Carbon Leakage in a Two-Region Hotelling Model, January 2010

2908 Margarita Katsimi and Vassilis Sarantides, Do Elections Affect the Composition of Fiscal Policy?, January 2010

2909 Rolf Golombek, Mads Greaker and Michael Hoel, Climate Policy without Commitment, January 2010

2910 Sascha O. Becker and Ludger Woessmann, The Effect of Protestantism on Education before the Industrialization: Evidence from 1816 Prussia, January 2010

2911 Michael Berlemann, Marco Oestmann and Marcel Thum, Demographic Change and Bank Profitability. Empirical Evidence from German Savings Banks, January 2010

2912 Øystein Foros, Hans Jarle Kind and Greg Shaffer, Mergers and Partial Ownership, January 2010

2913 Sean Holly, M. Hashem Pesaran and Takashi Yamagata, Spatial and Temporal Diffusion of House Prices in the UK, January 2010

2914 Christian Keuschnigg and Evelyn Ribi, Profit Taxation and Finance Constraints, January 2010

2915 Hendrik Vrijburg and Ruud A. de Mooij, Enhanced Cooperation in an Asymmetric Model of Tax Competition, January 2010

2916 Volker Meier and Martin Werding, Ageing and the Welfare State: Securing Sustainability, January 2010

2917 Thushyanthan Baskaran and Zohal Hessami, Globalization, Redistribution, and the Composition of Public Education Expenditures, January 2010

2918 Angel de la Fuente, Testing, not Modelling, the Impact of Cohesion Support: A Theoretical Framework and some Preliminary Results for the Spanish Regions, January 2010

2919 Bruno S. Frey and Paolo Pamini, World Heritage: Where Are We? An Empirical Analysis, January 2010

2920 Susanne Ek and Bertil Holmlund, Family Job Search, Wage Bargaining, and Optimal Unemployment Insurance, January 2010

2921 Mariagiovanna Baccara, Allan Collard-Wexler, Leonardo Felli and Leeat Yariv, Gender and Racial Biases: Evidence from Child Adoption, January 2010

2922 Kurt R. Brekke, Roberto Cellini, Luigi Siciliani and Odd Rune Straume, Competition and Quality in Regulated Markets with Sluggish Demand, January 2010

2923 Stefan Bauernschuster, Oliver Falck and Niels Große, Can Competition Spoil Reciprocity? – A Laboratory Experiment, January 2010

2924 Jerome L. Stein, A Critique of the Literature on the US Financial Debt Crisis, January 2010

2925 Erkki Koskela and Jan König, Profit Sharing, Wage Formation and Flexible Outsourcing under Labor Market Imperfection, January 2010

2926 Gabriella Legrenzi and Costas Milas, Spend-and-Tax Adjustments and the Sustainability of the Government's Intertemporal Budget Constraint, January 2010

2927 Piero Gottardi, Jean Marc Tallon and Paolo Ghirardato, Flexible Contracts, January 2010

2928 Gebhard Kirchgässner and Jürgen Wolters, The Role of Monetary Aggregates in the Policy Analysis of the Swiss National Bank, January 2010

2929 J. Trent Alexander, Michael Davern and Betsey Stevenson, Inaccurate Age and Sex Data in the Census PUMS Files: Evidence and Implications, January 2010

2930 Stefan Krasa and Mattias K. Polborn, Competition between Specialized Candidates, January 2010

2931 Yin-Wong Cheung and Xingwang Qian, Capital Flight: China's Experience, January 2010