World Applied Sciences Journal 11 (3): 269-277, 2010
ISSN 1818-4952

Vertical Price Transmission on the Iran Lamb Meat Market

Mohammad Taher Ahmadi Shadmehri and Mohammad Ahmadi

Department of Economics, School of Economics and Administers Sciences,
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Abstract: In the present paper, it is studied the price relations and how price is transmitted between the producer level and the consumer level for lamb meat. Data used in the research include consumer price index and producer price index for lamb meat covering monthly periods of 91 months since March 2001 through September 2008. Johansen's and Juselius's cointegration method and Granger causality test were used to examine whether there is a relationship between the two indices and to determine causality direction. The behavior of price transmission was analyzed based on the three models of Engle – Granger Error Correction Model (ECM-EG), Threshold Error Correction Model (TECM) and LSE-Henry general to specific model (GETS). The results indicate that there is a long-term relationship between each pair of producer and consumer prices. There is a causality direction from consumer prices to producer prices in both short-term and long-term periods. The results of three models reject the hypothesis of asymmetry in price transmission between producer prices and consumer prices.

JEL Classification: A1 % Q13 % C82

Key words: Iran, price transmission % Causality relation % Johansen and Juselius % Lamb % TECM model % GETS model

INTRODUCTION

Analysis of asymmetric price transmission along supply chain from producer to consumer for measuring competitiveness degree of different markets, welfare and political applications has a special place in applied economics. Asymmetric price transmission implies that retail prices response to increase and decrease of producer price differently. Price transmission from producer to retail level is vertical; however it is horizontal from market to market. Asymmetric price transmission in agricultural markets has been surveyed extensively by agricultural economists and numerous studies in this regard indicate that there is asymmetry in price transmission in most of agricultural products markets. According to Augier's and Santana's study [1], most of empirical estimations have been derived from stretches of price transmission under the assumption of symmetry in price transmission.

There are a wide range of reasons for existence of asymmetry in price transmission. Defective markets, price change costs, asymmetric information and political interventions are the most important factors influencing asymmetry in price transmission. First of all, based on "searching costs" theory, asymmetric transmission of price occurs when firms are able to benefit from rapid changes in prices [2]. Although consumers have unlimited choices, due to searching costs they face difficulties in gathering information rapidly about pricing of competitive shops. So, firms can increase retail price quickly when producer prices increase and they can decrease retail price much more slowly when producer prices decrease. The second problem is perishable goods; if producer price increases, it prevents retailer from increasing price. Both retailers and wholesalers having perishable goods resist against temptation of price increase because they likely face to demand reduction and perished goods. Third, "menu cost" strengthening asymmetry in price transmission. Menu costs include all costs incurred while re-pricing or adopting a new strategy of pricing.

Study of how price is transmitted is of high importance. First, along a supply chain, according to

Corresponding author: Mohammad Taher Ahmadi Shadmehri, Department of Economics,
School of Economics and Administers Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
Tel: +98-915-313-9260, Fax: +98-511-8811243, E-mail: mmm1326@yahoo.com.

economic theories, any changes in production costs in early stages of production should be transmitted to the producer price index in the next stages and eventually to consumer price index. Thus, changes in producer price index can contribute to prediction of subsequent changes in consumer price index which is used for prediction of inflation. Secondly, as Peltzman [3] suggested, asymmetric price transmission might imply the existence of gaps in the economic theory. Thus findings of asymmetric price transmission can provide opportunity for researcher to conclude about behavior of economic agents in market. Thirdly asymmetric price transmission could have welfare and thereby political applications. A possible application of asymmetric price transmission is that consumers don't benefit from price reduction in producer level or producers don't benefit from price increase in retail level. So, under the assumption of asymmetric price transmission, distribution of welfare effects in levels and among economic agents over shocks to a market would be changed corresponding to issue of asymmetric price transmission. Hence, asymmetric price transmission points to redistribution of welfare facilities and social services different from facilities obtained under condition of symmetry. Both redistribution and social and welfare losses provide obvious examples for political intervention by government.

The present paper studies vertical price transmission of lamb meat based on three methods of ECM-EG, TECM and GETS models. First it studies the causality relationship and direction of price between producer price index and retail index and then asymmetry in price transmission is analyzed. The important questions raised are as follows, first how change in price transmits along a supply chain? Second, to what extent, price changes in one side of market result in a positive or negative response in the other side?

Theoretical and Empirical Background

Theoretical Background: Given the importance of symmetry or asymmetry in price transmission from different aspects specially its relationship with validity of economic theories, numerous empirical efforts have been conducted over the last three decades to test the existence of asymmetric price transmission in different markets. Most of studies have been done based on variable splitting technique developed by Wollffarm [5] and later accepted by Houck [5]. In Houck's method, asymmetric price transmission is studied based on dividing price variables into decreasing and increasing stages. This method has been employed extensively in studies of agricultural economics to survey asymmetric price transmission. Study the asymmetric price in beef, pork and dairy products market, peanut butter and chicken industry in U.S, asymmetric price in markets of beef, pork and lamb, retail and wholesale markets for Australian red apple and finally studies of the asymmetric price transmission of farm to retail in tomato, onion, milk powder, coffee, rice and bean in brazil are some of such examples.

Von Cramon Taubadel and Fahl Busch [6] demonstrated that an asymmetric Error Correction Model (ECM) based on Granger's and Lee's [7] work could also be used for testing asymmetric price transmission. Likewise, Von Cramon Taubadel and Loy [8] and Taubadel, V. C., Meyer J. [5] indicated that such methods as Wolfarm- Houck's are basically contradicted with cointegration and since time series of price are non-stationary, using the cointegration methods and error correction model (ECM) to study asymmetric price transmission is more appropriate than other methods such as ARDL, because different types of ARDL models are contrary to cointegration concept. In addition, Keele [9] also demonstrated that ECM model is applicable even with reliable data and in this case it models this type of data better than ARDL model.

Empirical Backgrounds: The asymmetry in price transmission mechanism between the producers and the consumers has been surveyed with the application of different empirical models. Various empirical works support the existence of asymmetric transmission price between producer and retailer.

An important study regarding asymmetry in price transmission mechanism is the one developed by Rao and Rao [10]. In this study, the asymmetry in price transmission mechanism is surveyed between the petroleum and gasoline with the application of the LES-Hendry general-to-specific approach. They confirmed empirically the existence of asymmetry in price transmission mechanism.

Von Cramon- Tabadel [11] discovered the asymmetric formation of price in German pork market. Davson and Tifin [12] identified the long-run relationships between retail prices in lamb farm in England and studied the

features of structural and seasonal failure of series and concluded that Granger causality direction is from retail price to producer price, so that price of lamb is adjusted in the retail market. Goodwin and Harper [13] and Kaabia, Gill and Boshenjaku [14] developed threshold autoregressive models and studied beef division in the U.S, pork division in the U.S and lamb division in Spain; respectively. Goodwin and Holt [15] found that agricultural markets are conformed with shocks of wholesale market; however shocks effects of retail market are considerably limited to retail markets.

Abdullahi [16] used a momentum- threshold autoregressive model (M-TAR) while studying the formation of price in Swiss pork market. He also concluded that price formation between levels of producer and retail market is asymmetric i.e. increase of producer prices decreasing marketing margin is transmitted more rapidly than decrease of producer price expanding marketing margins.

Rezitis [17] used a general autoregressive conditional variance heterogeneous method (GARCH) while studying causality, formation of price and external effects in Greek markets of pork, lamb and poultry. Bakucs and Ferto [18] used VECM to study the price formation concerning pork market in Hungary, detected competitive pricing and didn't find any evidence of asymmetric formation of price.

There are very few studies concerning price transmission in different markets of Iran and they don't have long history. In other words, this subject is considered by limited number of Iranian researchers only in recent years. The following researches are the most important ones. Hoseini-Ghahremanzadeh [19] in a paper titled as "asymmetric adjustment and price transmission in Iranian meat market" studied how price is transmitted in meat market of Iran. In this paper, threshold cointegration method and data of seasonal time series of meat price throughout Iran and in the period of 1994-2002 were utilized. Also short run adjustments of this market were analyzed by employing asymmetric error correction models. The findings of the research indicate that transmission between producer and retail prices of meat is asymmetric.

In the other paper titled as " price transmission model of Iranian pistachio in global market", Hoseini [20] studied how price is transmitted from farm to export prices as well as global prices of pistachio in the period of 1986-2002. The results of Granger causality test indicate that price changes in farm to export market and from export market to farm are asymmetric and price reduction from farm is transmitted to export level more rapidly and completely than price increase.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data for the lamb in this study include monthly price indices for producers and retailers from March 2001 through September 2008, which makes a total of 91 observations. Producer prices for lamb product was obtained from the Agricultural Price Indices (1997=100) provided by the Statistical Center of Iran. Retail (Consumer) prices for lamb product was obtained from the publication of the Consumer Price Index (1997=100) provided by the Central Bank of Iran.

The econometric analysis of the asymmetry in the price transmission was completed in four steps. First, the price series used in this study are tested for stationary test of time series as an essential process before the application of Johansen cointegration technique. In the present paper the unit root test employed in our data is Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test [21]. In order to determine the ADF form we used the Schwartz–Bayesian (SBC) [5] criterion and for every time series we chose the model, for which the SBC criterion has, the lowest value. Second, if the series are found to be integrated of order one, testing for cointegration is performed by specifying a Vector Autoregressive Model (VAR)[21] and use the Johansen technique [22] to test the existence of a long-run relationship between the price indices and estimation of cointegration vector. Regarding the estimation of the cointegration vectors, the treatment of the Johansen's maximum likelihood [21] approach was used. As we know, the Johansen cointegration technique can be applied since the time series are on-stationary in levels and stationary in first differences. In order to apply the Johansen technique it is necessary to calculate the number of lags of the endogenous variables of the model, so to satisfy this purpose we formulate VAR model using level values of variables and determine its rank using Aikatic (AIC) and Swartz-basin (SBC) and likelihood(LR) tests[21].

After confirming the existence of a long-run relationship between the price indices and in the third step, the dynamic Error Correction Model introduced by Engle and Granger [7] aiming at the determination of the direction of the causality was used. The ECM Engle-Granger has the following form given by the following equations.

$$\Delta PP_t = m_1 + \sum_{t=1}^{n_1} b_{pp}\Delta \mathrm{PP}_{t-1} + \sum_{t=0}^{n_2} b_{pc}\Delta \mathrm{PC}_{t-1} - p_1 Z_{t1-1} + e_{t1}$$

$$\Delta PC_t = m_2 + \sum_{t=1}^{n_1} b_{pp}\Delta \mathrm{PP}_{t-1} + \sum_{t=0}^{n_2} b_{pc}\Delta \mathrm{PC}_{t-1} - p_2 Z_{t2-1} + e_{t2}$$

Where n1 and n2 are lags lengths, PPI and CPI are producer and consumer price index in the period t respectively and $Z_{1t-1} = PPI_{t-1} - \text{"}_0 - \text{"}_1 CPI_{t-1}$ and $Z_{2t-1} = CPI_{t-1} - *_0 - *_1 PPI_{t-1}$.

The possible results of this method are the following;

") $B_1 \ldots 0$, $B_2 \ldots 0$, there is a long-term two-way relationship between the two variables.

$) $B_1 = 0$, $B_2 \ldots 0$ In the long run the producer price causes the consumer price.

() $B_1 \ldots 0$, $B_2 = 0$ In the long run the consumer price is the cause for the formation of the producer price.

Finally, after determination of causality relationship between the two variables, asymmetry in lamb market was studied using three different models are given by the following equations:

Engle-Granger Error Correction Model (ECM-EG), that recently used for wood productions by Koutroumanidis, Zafeririou and Arabatzis [23], Reziti, I.,Panagopoulos [24] and Zhou and Buongiorno [25] in different agricultural products. This model formulated based on Houck's model [4] later which developed by Granger and Lee [7] with dividing components of error correction into positive and negative components and finally resulted in the following form by dividing)P into positive and negative components by Tabadel and Loy [8].

$$\Delta PC_t = m_1 + \sum_{t=0}^{n_2} a_k^- \Delta CPI_{t-1}^- + \sum_{t=1}^{n_1} b_k^- \Delta PPI_{t-1}^- - p^- EC_{t-1} +$$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{n_3} a_k^+ \Delta CPI_{t-1}^+ + \sum_{t=1}^{n_4} b_k^+ \Delta PPI_{t-1}^+ - p^+ EC_{t-1} + e_t$$

Above equations consist of two parts, a part with positive superscript on coefficients and variables indicating price increase, another part with negative superscript concerning price reduction. For example, B+ and B- are used when Z > 0 and Z < 0 respectively (coefficients of B+ and B- are rates of price adjustment to positive and negative shocks of marketing margin, respectively). Moreover, $)CPI_{t-1}$ and $)PPI_{t-1}$ are following:

$$\Delta CPI_{t-1}^- = \begin{cases} \Delta CPI_{t-1} & if \quad \Delta CPI_{t-1} \langle 0 \\ 0 & if \quad \Delta CPI_{t-1} \rangle 0 \end{cases} \qquad \Delta CPI_{t-1}^+ = \begin{cases} \Delta CPI_{t-1} & if \quad \Delta CPI_{t-1} \rangle 0 \\ 0 & if \quad \Delta CPI_{t-1} \langle 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\Delta PPI_{t-1}^- = \begin{cases} \Delta PPI_{t-1} & if \quad \Delta PPI_{t-1} \langle 0 \\ 0 & if \quad \Delta PPI_{t-1} \rangle 0 \end{cases} \qquad \Delta PPI_{t-1}^+ = \begin{cases} \Delta PPI_{t-1} & if \quad \Delta PPI_{t-1} \rangle 0 \\ 0 & if \quad \Delta PPI_{t-1} \langle 0 \end{cases}$$

The ECM–EG model is solved with the least squares method and then we applied the Wald test. In particular, we examined the validity of the equality $B^+ = B^-$.

Threshold Error-Correction Model: As noted by Enders and Siklos [26], a more general specification may incorporate threshold effects of lagged $)PP_t$ and $)CP_t$ depending on whether EC_{t-1} is positive or negative. To evaluate the potential asymmetry in price transmission to PPI_t from CPI_t, we consider the following threshold model:

$$\Delta PP_t = m + \begin{cases} p^+ EC_{t-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k^+ \Delta CP_{t-k} + \sum_{k=1}^{p} b_k^+ \Delta PP_{t-k} + V_t & if \quad PP_{t-1} < x_0 + x_1 CP_{t-1} \\ p^- EC_{t-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{p} a_k^- \Delta CP_{t-k} + \sum_{k=1}^{p} b_k^- \Delta PP_{t-k} + V_t & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where: $Ec_{t-1} = Pp_{t-1} - >_0 - >_1 CP_{t-1}$

After the estimation of the model we applied the Wald test. In particular, we examined the validity of the equality $B^+ = B^-$.

It should be noted that the threshold here is defined with respect to PP_t being above or below its equilibrium level relative to CP_t. In the other studies the explanatory variables are typically split into two regimes based on the sign of $)CP_t$ in individual periods. To the extent that market price adjustments are not instantaneous, defining the regimes based on whether CP_t is increasing or decreasing in specific periods may lead to misleading inferences on the actual response of PP_t because it ignores the information reflected by the relative equilibrium level of PP_t and CP_t.

The LSE–Hendry General-to-Specific Model (GETS). In the case of the agricultural products, the GETS model has not been applied before and is less preferable than VAR and cointegrating VAR approaches [10] and Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) [24]. However, according to Hendry [27], the GETS model is being criticized quite often because the prices used are considered to be cointegrated under assumption, without having been tested before. Additionally, GETS is being subject to criticisms for mixing I (0) to I (1) variables. This argument is not valid given that GETS model accepts the existence of the relationship between the dependent and the explanatory variables in their levels. Due to this fact, the levels of the variables are regarded as cointegrated and consequently their linear combination is I (0) [27].

The GETS model has the following form:

$$\Delta PPI_t = \sum_{t=0}^{n_1} a_k^+ \Delta CPI_{t-1}^+ + \sum_{t=1}^{n_2} b_k^+ \Delta PPI_{t-1}^+ + p^+(PPI_{t-1} - f_0 - f_1 CPI_{t-1} - f_2 T) +$$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{n_3} a_k^- \Delta CPI_{t-1}^- + \sum_{t=1}^{n_4} b_k^- \Delta PPI_{t-1}^- + p^-(PPI_{t-1} - f_0 - f_1 CPI_{t-1} - f_2 T) + x_{ti}$$

Where coefficients of B^+ and B^- are rates of price adjustment to positive and negative shocks of marketing margin, respectively. An alternative form is given by the following equation:

$$\Delta PPI_t = g_0 + g_1 T + \sum_{t=0}^{n_1} a_k^+ \Delta CPI_{t-1}^+ + \sum_{t=1}^{n_2} b_k^+ \Delta PPI_{t-1}^+ + p^+(PPI_{t-1} - f_0 - f_1 CPI_{t-1}) +$$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{n_3} a_k^- \Delta CPI_{t-1}^- + \sum_{t=1}^{n_4} b_k^- \Delta PPI_{t-1}^- + p^-(PPI_{t-1} - f_0 - f_1 CPI_{t-1}) + x_{ti}$$

Where: $(_0 = (2^+ + 2^-)*N_0$

$(_1 = (2^+ + 2^-)*N_2$

After the estimation of the model we applied the Wald test. In particular, we examined the validity of the equality $B^+ = B^-$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The application of the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) method confirmed that the time series of the variables under study are 1 (1) (table 1) and consequently they might give a linear combination of variables that is 1 (0). To employ Johansen technique, it is necessary to calculate numbers of lags of endogenous variables in the model.

According to results taken by E-views 5.0 software, AIC and LR suggest optimum lag of 4 and SBC suggests lag of 3. So in this research we chose optimum lag of 3 according to Schwartz–Bayesian criterion (table 2). The cointegration analysis of Johansen–Juselius, using the maximum likelihood of Johansen–Juselius [22], that involves the use of the trace and the maximum eigenvalue statistic, indicates two cointegration vectors between the producer and the consumer prices (table 3). It should be noted that the maximum number of cointegration vectors must be r = n – 1 (where n is the number of model variables) vector. So concerning the number of model variables that include two variables, there is one cointegration vector that has following form:

$$CPI_t = -18.94878 + 1.36425 PPI_t$$

T –s: (-4.268) (28.495)

Table 1: Result of Unit Root test

		CPI		PPI	
Variable		First Differences	level	First Differences	level
Lag length		1	10	0	1
ADF		6.842699-	1.994852-	6.879133-	2.206990-
Critical	1%	4.065702-	4.076860-	3.505595-	4.064453-
	5%	3.461686-	3.466966-	2.894332-	3.461094-
value	10%	3.157121-	3.160198-	2.5884325-	3.156779-

Table 2: Result of Optimum Lag for Johansen technique

Lag length (q)	(*Lnl*)	AIC(q)	SBC(q)	LR
1	383.2203-	9.37880	9.55365	-
2	354.9527-	8.79404	9.08546	53.12954
3	342.1618-	8.58221	8.99021*	23.42426
4	333.7861-	8.47677*	9.00134	14.93507*

Table 3: Johansen tests for cointegration vectors

Term	Null hypothesis	Alternative hypothesis	statistic	0.05 critical value
Trace statistic	r =0	r $ 1	34.5070	20.2618
	r #1	r $ 2	9.4462	9.1645
Max–Eigen statistic	r =0	r = 1	25.0607	15.8921
	r #1	r =2	9.4462	9.1645

Thus, Johansen technique confirms the existence of a long-run equilibrium relationship between consumer and producer prices in the lamb market and so it can be studied the Granger causality and symmetry price transmission tests.

Based on causality test and according to table 4 it is concluded that in the both long run and short run, there is a Granger causality relationship between consumer and producer prices taking into account the significance of coefficients of lagged error correction Z_{1t-1} and Z_{2t-1}, so that in the both long run and short run consumer prices influence the producer prices. The result is confirmed with co-test and regarding synchronous significance of coefficients) *CPI* and Z_{1t-1}. In other words, significance of coefficients of) *CPI* indicates that in the short run *CPI* influences the *PPI*, however since coefficients of) *PPI* isn't significant, *PPI* can't influence the *CPI* in the short run (Table 4). According to this result, traces of positive or negative shocks in production costs are limited to producer (and transmitted to consumer prices) so that profit margin and lamb meat producers' welfare are affected negatively while increase in production costs. Moreover, negative shocks in retailer prices are transmitted to producer prices so that profit margin and lamb meat producers' welfare are affected negatively. On the other hand, different shocks of markets reflecting in producer price index.

- Significant test of coefficients lagged variables using Wald method
- Significant test of coefficient of lagged error correction term using t-statistic test
- Synchronous test of Significant of coefficients of lagged variables and lagged error correction term using Wald method

The causality relationship from consumer to producer prices in Iran's lamb market is attributable to two important factors; perishability of lamb meat and willing to purchase fresh meat (in the case of Iran, the people prefer to use fresh lamb meat, so freezed lamb meat is cheaper than fresh lamb meat). Therefore, the producers must to sale their products at the market price. In this case, marketing margin in the market in both shocks are almost in favor of retailers.

After estimation of causality relationship, the fourth stage which is symmetric price transmission test should be surveyed. This has been done by ECM-EG, TECM and GETS models. The long-run adjustment of PP_t is determined by the parameters, B$^+$ and B$^-$. The short-run adjustment of PP_t, which is governed by the parameters, "6$^+$, "6$^-$, 6^+$ and 6^-$(for k =1, 2,..., p), may come either from its own history of lagged dynamics or from the lagged effects of CP_t. If B$^+$ … B$^-$ PP_t, exhibits asymmetry in long-run adjustment. If either "6$^+$… "6$^-$ or 6^+$… 6^- or both, PP_t displays asymmetry in short-run adjustment.
The results are shown in table 5. As table 5 shows, in three models, (showing producer price response to changes in consumer prices), based on Wald test, null hypothesis regarding the existence of symmetry in price transmission from producer to consumer in both long run and short run has not been rejected. It implies that, response of producer prices to negative and positive changes in consumer prices is symmetric in both the long

Table 4: Result of Granger causality Test

				Long - run causality test			
Tests		Short-run causality test		$^2Z_{t-1}$		Co - Test	
Variables		) *CPI*	) *PPI*	Z_{1t-1}	Z_{2t-1}	) *CPI*&Z_{1t-1}	) *PPI*&Z_{2t-1}
H_0		$B_{PC} = 0$	$B_{PP} = 0$	$B_1 = 0$	$B_2 = 0$	$B_1 = 0, B_{PC} = 0$	$B_2 = 0, B_{PP} = 0$
Dependent Variables	) *CPI*	23.8031		4.2855-		18.1814	
		(0.000)		(0.0001)		(0.000)	
	) *CPI*		1.1536		0.0147-		0.9008
			(0.332)		(0.548)		(0.4676)

Table 5: Result of Asymmetric in Lamb Market

	TECM Model		GETS Model		ECM-EG Model	
Variables	coefficients	t statistics	coefficients	t statistics	coefficients	t statistics
Constant	-	-	5.1855	3.4894	0.4796	1.2583
T	-	-	0.0808-	3.1664-	-	-
ΔPPI_{t-1}^{+}	0.7034-	1.7312-	0.1195	0.7639	0.0143-	0.1018-
ΔPPI_{t-2}^{+}	1.3145-	3.8290-	-	-	-	-
ΔPPI_{t-3}^{+}	0.6521-	1.4186-	-	-	-	-
ΔPPI_{t-1}^{-}	-	-	0.3250	2.0118	0.2083	1.8808
ΔPPI_{t-2}^{-}	0.0777-	0.6810-	-	-	-	-
ΔPPI_{t-3}^{-}	0.3247-	2.2899-	-	-	-	-
ΔCPI_{t}^{+}	-	-	1.3665	7.0111	1.3248	9.8545
ΔCPI_{t-1}^{+}	2.3368	5.3419	-	-	0.1993	0.8327
ΔCPI_{t-2}^{+}	-	-	0.1854	0.9444	-	-
ΔCPI_{t-3}^{+}	1.4128	2.6027	-	-	-	-
ΔCPI_{t}^{-}	-	-	1.4362-	1.3756-	1.2156-	0.6740-
ΔCPI_{t-1}^{-}	1.7602	8.1695	0.9646	0.9187	1.2473	0.7830
ΔCPI_{t-2}^{-}	1.0365-	3.3090-	0.9966-	1.0879-	-	-
ΔCPI_{t-3}^{-}	1.1368	4.0120	-	-	-	-
p_1^{+}	1.3301-	1.6009-	0.4703-	3.9597-	0.3283-	3.3026-
p_1^{-}	0.2824-	3.8905-	0.8095-	1.8586-	0.7145-	2.1770-
R^2	0.5399		0.6147		0.5931	
AIC	5.1449		4.9159		4.9385	
SBC	5.4873		5.2256		5.1936	
H_0	Wald Method Symmetry test with					
$B^+ = B^-$	F- Statistic =1.575 (0.2133)		F- Statistic =0.571 (0.4521)		F- Statistic =0.975(0.3264)	
	P^2 = 1.5756(0.2094)		P^2 = 0.57104(0.4498)		P^2 = 0.9753(0.3233)	
	F- Statistic = 2.604(0.1108)		F -Statistic = 1.43(0.2354)		F- Statistic = 0.931(0.3374)	
	P^2 = 2.6048(0.1065)		P^2 = 1.43(0.2318)		P^2 = 0.9315(0.3345)	
	F Statistic =0.928 (0.3998)		F Statistic = 1.655 (0.1978)		F Statistic = 1.24 (0.2942)	
	P^2 = 1.8561(0.3953)		P^2 = 3.3112(0.1910)		P^2 = 2.486(0.2885)	

run and short run. Given variable factors of error correction and the results of Wald test [21] equation (d) (indicating response of producer prices to changes in consumer prices) it is concluded that price transmission whether short run or long run from consumer to producer is symmetric. Therefore, marketing margin in the market in both shocks are almost the same. Moreover, the symmetric price transmission in Iran's lamb market is attributable to the fact of existence of large number of producer and retailer.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The analysis of how price is transmitted along a supply chain from producer price to consumer price and possible existence of asymmetric transmission is of high importance in economics literature. In the present study, price relationships and how price is transmitted between producer and consumer levels have been surveyed for lamb meat in Iran. With the assistance of Johansen-Jesiules technique, it was confirmed that there is a long run equilibrium relationship between consumer and producer prices in lamb meat market. Granger test indicated that there is a causality relationship from consumer to producer prices in the both long run and short run.

Null hypothesis regarding symmetry in price transmission from consumer to producer is rejected in the both long run and short run. So that prices are set on the retail market and the retailers make 'offers' to producers down on the marketing chain. Therefore, given the causality direction of price from consumer to producer and the symmetry in the price transmission in the long run, it can be said that finding of this study do not imply market power or supernormal profits among producers in the Iran lamb meat market. The results of this study have confirmed the findings of Bojnec [28], that even the less developed and regulated markets, can perform as competitive markets.

Finally, more studies are suggested regarding direction and the way of price transmission in perishable goods market and especially agricultural products, as well as the analysis of welfare issues and comparing costs and benefits resulting form adoption different policies by government in these markets are necessary.

REFERENCES

1. Aguiar, D. and J.A. Santana, 2002. Asymmetry in Farm to Retail Price Transmission: Evidence for Brazil, Agribusiness, 18: 37-48.
2. Miller, J.D. and M.L. Hayenga, 2001. Price Cycles and Asymmetric Price Transmission in the U.S. Pork Market. American J. Agri. Economics, 83: 551-561.
3. Peltzman, S., 2000. Prices Rise Faster Than They Fall, J. Political Economy. 108: 466-502.
4. Houck, P.J., 1977. An Approach to Specifying and Estimating Non-Reversible Functions. American J. Agri. Economics, 59: 570-572.
5. Taubadel, V.C. and J. Meyer, 2004. Asymmetric price transmission: a survey. J. Agri. Economics, 50: 581-611.
6. Taubadel, V.C. and S. Fahlbusch, 1994. Identifying Asymmetric Price Transmission with Error Correction Models. Working Paper.
7. Granger, C.W.J. and T.H. Lee, 1989. Investigation of Producer, Sales and Inventory Relationship Using Multi-cointegration and Non- Symmetric Error Correction Models. J. Appl. Economics, 4: 145-159.
8. Taubadel, V.C. and J.P. Loy, 1999. The Identification of Asymmetric Price Transmission Processes with Integrated Time Series. Jahrbucher for Nationalokonomie und Statistik, 218: 85-106.
9. Keele L., 2005. Not just for cointegration: error correction models with stationary data. Nuffield College Working Papers, N: W7.
10. Rao, B.B. and G. Rao, 2005. Are US gasoline price adjustments asymmetric?. Working Paper, Department of Economics, the University of the South Pacific.
11. Taubadel, V.C., 1998. Estimating Asymmetric Price Transmission With the Error Correction Representation: An Application to the German Pork Market. European Review of Agricultural Economics, 25: 1-18.
12. Tiffin, R. and P.J. Dawson, 2000. Structural breaks, cointegration and the farm-retail spread for lamb. Appl. Economics, 32: 1281-1286.
13. Goodwin, B.K. and D.C. Harper, 2000. Price transmission, threshold behaviour and asymmetric adjustment in the U.S. pork sector. J. Agricultural and Appl. Economics, 32: 543-553.
14. Kaabia, B., M. Gill and L. Boshnjaku, 2002. Price transmission asymmetries in the Spanish lamb sector. Paper presented at the X. Congress of European Association of Agri. Economists, 28-31 August, Zaragoza, Spain.
15. Goodwin, B.K. and M.T. Holt 1999. Price transmission and asymmetric adjustment in the US beef sector. American J. Agri. Economics, 81: 630-637.

16. Abdulai, A., 2002. Using threshold cointegration to estimate asymmetric price transmission in the Swish pork market. Applied Economics, 34: 679-687.
17. Rezitis, A., 2003. Mean and volatility spillover in Greek producer-consumer meat prices. Appl. Economics Lett., 10: 381-384.
18. Bakucs, L.Z. and I. Fetro, 2005. Marketing Margins and Price Transmission on the Hungarian Pork Meat Market. Agribusines, 21(2): 273-286.
19. Hosseini, S. and M. Ghahreman, 2006. Asymmetric Adjustment and Price Transmission in Meat Market of Iran. J. Agric. Sci. and Technol., 53: 1-22.
20. Hosseini, S., 2006. Model of Price Transmission of Iran's Pistachio in the World Market. J. Agricultural Sciences and Technol., 1: 145-153.
21. Enders, W., 2007. Applied Econometrics Time Series. Translated by: Sadeghi, M. and Shavvalpour, S., ISU press, Tehran, First Edition.
22. Johansen, S. and K. Juselius, 1990. Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference on Cointegration-with Applications to the Demand for Money. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 52: 169-210.
23. Koutroumanidis, T., E. Zafeririou and G. Arabatzis, 2009. Asymmetry in transmission between the producer and the consumer prices of the wood sector and the role of imports: The case of Greece. Forest Policy Economics, 11: 56-64.
24. Reziti, I. and Y. Panagopoulos, 2008. The price transmission mechanism in the Greek agrifood sector: some tests. Agribusiness, 24: 16-30.
25. Zhou, M. and J. Buongiorno, 2005. Price transmission between products at different stages of manufacturing in forest industries. J. Forest Economics, 11: 5-19.
26. Enders, W. and P.L. Siklos, 2001. Cointegration and threshold adjustment. J. Business and Economic Statistics, 19: 166-176.
27. Hendry, D.F. and H.M. Krolzig, 2005. The properties of automatic GETS modeling. The Economic J., 32-61.
28. Bojnec, S., 2002. Price Transmission and Marketing Margins in the Slovenian Beef and Pork Markets during Transition. Paper presented at the X. Congress of European Association of Agricultural Economists, 28-31 August, Zaragoza, Spain.