**Tables**

**Table A2: ADF-GLS tests**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test with constant and without trend | | | |
| **Variable** | **Lags** | **Test statistic** | **Conclusion** |
|  | 0 | -1.80 \* | I(0) |
|  | 2 | -1.98 \*\* |
|  | 3 | -2.68 \*\*\* |
|  | 0 | -3.39 \*\*\* |
|  | 1 | -3.11\*\*\* |
|  | 0 | -3.70 \*\*\* |

**Note 1:** ADF-GLS (Elliot et al. 1996) tests were performed using Gretl (2017).

**Note 2:** In the ADF-GLS tests, \*, \*\* and \*\*\* denote the rejection of the null hypothesis () of a unit root at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels. The maximum number of lags was chosen using the rule provided by Schwert (1989). The actual lag was obtained by testing down in order to optimise the Schwarz/Bayesian information criterion (SIC/BIC).

**Note 3:** ADF-GLS is not only considered to be a modified and improved version of the original ADF test of Dickey and Fuller (1979), but also a more suitable test in the case of small samples (Baum, 2000).

**Table A3: KPSS tests**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test with constant and without trend | | | |
| **Variable** | **Lags** | **Test statistic** | **Conclusion** |
|  | 2 | 0.11 | I(0) |
|  | 2 | 0.13 |
|  | 2 | 0.15 |
|  | 2 | 0.09 |
|  | 2 | 0.12 |
|  | 2 | 0.25 |

**Note 1:** KPSS tests (Kwiatkwoski et al. 1992) were performed using Gretl (2017).

**Note 2:** In the KPSS test, \*, \*\* and \*\*\* denote the rejection of the null hypothesis () of stationarity at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels. The optimal lag was obtained using the Newey-West automatic bandwidth selection.

**Table A4: Unit root tests with a breakpoint**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test with constant and without trend | | | | |
| **Variable** | **Break date** | **Lags** | **Test Statistic** | **Conclusion** |
|  | 1974 | 0 | -4.70 \*\* | I(0) |
|  | 1969 | 0 | -10.35 \*\*\* |
|  | 1954 | 0 | -11.48 \*\*\* |
|  | 1972 | 2 | -6.35 \*\* |
|  | 1974 | 1 | -6.30 \*\*\* |
|  | 1959 | 2 | -6.54 \*\*\* |

**Note 1:** Unit root tests with a breakpoint (EViews 2020 following Perron 1989) were performed using EViews (2020).

**Note 2:** In the unit root tests with a breakpoint, \*, \*\* and \*\*\* denote the rejection of the null hypothesis () of a unit root with a possible break at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels. The maximum number of lags was chosen using the rule provided by Schwert (1989). The actual lag was obtained by testing down in order to optimise the Schwarz/Bayesian information criterion (SIC/BIC).
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