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Why did the Canadian dollar appreciate so rapidly?

• Real oil prices and non-energy commodity prices increased by 150% and 70%, respectively, between 2002 and 2008.
  – Large appreciations of commodity exporters (Australia, Canada, New Zealand) against the U.S. dollar likely linked to commodity prices;
  – If this is true, why did commodity importers (euro area and U.K.) appreciate, too, against the U.S. dollar?
Changes in exchange rates 2000-2008

Graph showing changes in exchange rates from 2000 to 2008 for CAD, EURO, YEN, NZD, AUD, and GBP.
## 2 Related literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latent factor models (empirical finance)</td>
<td>Good results, but economic interpretation not always clear</td>
<td>Diebold and Nerlove 1989, Mahieu and Schotman 1994, Dungey 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Empirical methodology

- Extract common movements in the panel of exchange rates using:
  - Dynamic principal factor analysis
  - State-space model

- Each has relative advantages and disadvantages.
Models

• The principal factor model:
  – Purely statistical technique, relies on a minimum of restrictions and assumptions
• The state-space model
  – Imposes more structure on the data
  – Facilitates statistical inference
  – Allows for explicit links between common/specific components and an economic variable
  – Can be sensitive to the assumptions regarding the processes of the unobservable variables
Data

• We use real U.S. bilateral exchange rates for Australia, Canada, the euro area, Japan, U.K. and New Zealand.

• Sample: 1981Q1-2007Q4 (currencies floated freely against the U.S. dollar).

• Most exchange rates I(1); small first-order autoregressive term (0.3), so we use the data in first differences
3.1 Dynamic principal factor model

- We start by estimating a dynamic factor model.
- We normalize each exchange rate by its standard deviation to ensure equal contribution to the total variance of the model.
- Panel of $p$ real U.S. dollar exchange rates $(X=(x_1, \ldots, x_p)^\prime)$ with mean $\mu$ can be expressed as linear functions of $m$ ($m < p$) hypothetical common factors $(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$, plus an error term.

\[
X_t - \mu = LF_t + \varepsilon_t \\
f_t = l_1 f_{t-1} + l_2 f_{t-2} + \ldots + l_p f_{t-p} + \nu_t \\
\varepsilon_t = \alpha_1 \varepsilon_{t-1} + \alpha_2 \varepsilon_{t-2} + \ldots + \alpha_q \varepsilon_{t-q} + \zeta_t
\]
Results from the dynamic factor model

We find two factors (eigenvalue of the third factor 0.3)
Results robust to estimation of a static or dynamic factor model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 What drives the factors?

- Factor models useful to detect patterns in the data, but more evidence needed for economic interpretation.
- Strategy:
  1. Cointegration tests
     - Relative fiscal position
     - Short-term interest rates
     - Commodity prices
     - No evidence for productivity differentials
  2. Building a state space model that incorporates the factors directly.
What drives the factors? Insights from the literature

1. Productivity shocks (Balassa/Samuelson effect)

2. Fiscal policy: Rising government debt leads to fall in savings and lowers net foreign assets-to-GDP ratio; leading to a depreciation to facilitate build-up of current account surpluses (Blanchard, 1985; Weil, 1989).

3. Commodity prices, which proxy exogenous terms-of-trade shocks (Chen and Rogoff, 2003).
What drives the first factor ("U.S. factor")?

- We estimate dynamic factor models for government debt-to-GDP ratios (relative to US) and productivity differentials. In both cases, the first factor moves in the same direction for all country pairs.

- First factor of our exchange rate panel is cointegrated with the first factor of government debt, but not with productivity differentials.
  - A deterioration in the U.S. fiscal position - relative to all other countries - leads to a long-run, multilateral U.S. dollar depreciation.
  - This is in line with overlapping generations models (Ganelli, 2005; and Kumhoff and Laxton, 2007).
First factor: relative U.S. fiscal position

U.S. Factor (First Factor) = Solid Blue; Relative Debt (Bilateral Common Factor; Inverted) = Dashed Red
What drives the second factor?

- Pattern of the loading factor suggests that commodity prices might play a role.
- Indeed, second factor cointegrated with real energy and non-energy commodity prices.
Second factor: Commodity prices

Commodity Factor (Second Factor) = Solid Blue; Oil = Dashed Red
Second factor: Commodity prices

Commodity Factor (Second Factor) = Solid Blue; Non Energy Commodities = Dashed Red
## Cointegration tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First factor</th>
<th>Second factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test statistic (Saikonnen)</td>
<td>-4.11</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test statistic (Engle-Granger)</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
<td>-4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical values</td>
<td>1% -4.44</td>
<td>-4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% -3.83</td>
<td>-3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% -3.52</td>
<td>-3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loading factor 2 vs. net commodity imports, relative to the US
3.3 State space model

• We build a state-space model which incorporates:
  – A direct link between the first factor and the first factor of the relative debt-to-GDP ratio
  – A direct link between the second factor and energy- and non-energy commodity prices
  – The factor in the short-term interest rate differential drives the short-term dynamics of the exchange rate
State-space model

\[ X_t^i = \gamma_1^i C_t^1 + \left(\gamma_2^i + D^{93} \gamma^{CAN} \right) C_t^2 + v_t^i \]
\[ \Delta C_t^1 = \phi_1 C_{t-1}^1 + \beta_1 \text{rdiff}_{t-1} - \lambda_1 \left( C_{t-1}^1 - \beta_2 \text{Debt}_{t-1} \right) + \eta_t^1 \]
\[ \Delta C_t^2 = \phi_2 C_{t-1}^2 - \lambda_2 \left( C_{t-1}^2 - \beta_3 p_{t-1}^{NE} - \beta_4 p_{t-1}^{Oil} \right) + \eta_t^2 \]
\[ D(L)v_t^i = \varepsilon_t^i \text{ for all } i \]

- \( p^{oil} \): real WTI oil price,
- \( p^{NE} \): real IMF non-energy commodity prices
- \( \text{Debt}_i \): symmetrical common component of the debt/GDP ratio, relative to the U.S. debt/GDP
- \( \text{rdiff}_i \): Symmetrical common component of the short-run real interest rate differential with the U.S.
- \( D93 \): dummy for energy liberalization in Canada
Estimation of the structural state space

### US Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1^{AU}$</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1^{CAN}$</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1^{EU}$</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>17.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1^{JA}$</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1^{NZ}$</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1^{UK}$</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commodity factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2^{AU}$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2^{CAN}$</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2^{EU}$</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2^{JA}$</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2^{NZ}$</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2^{UK}$</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2^{CAN}$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimation of the structural state space: Cointegration relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cointegration Parameters</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>T-Stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1$</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_2$</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_3$</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_4$</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U.S. factor: Factor model vs. state-space model

PrINCIPAL COMPONENT Model = Solid Blue; State Space Model = Dashed Red

Commodity factor: Factor model vs. state-space model

Principal Component Model = Solid Blue; State Space Model = Dashed Red
3.4 Historical decomposition: Euro area

Fratzscher (2007): Europe has borne the bulk of the adjustment of the U.S. dollar effective exchange rate over the past 25 years.
Historical decomposition: Canada
Historical decomposition: Japan

U.S. Factor = Solid Blue; Commodity Factor = Dashed Red; Domestic Factor = Dotted Black
Historical decomposition: UK

U.S. Factor = Solid Blue; Commodity Factor = Dashed Red; Domestic Factor = Dotted Black
Historical decomposition: Australia

U.S. Factor = Solid Blue; Commodity Factor = Dashed Red; Domestic Factor = Dotted Black
Historical decomposition: New Zealand

U.S. Factor = Solid Blue; Commodity Factor = Dashed Red; Domestic Factor = Dotted Black
3.5 Robustness checks

Key results are robust to;

- Estimation sample (post-Bretton Woods or 1980-2007)
- Methodology to extract the common components (principal factor model or state-space model)
- Changing the nummeraire currency (USD or euro)
- Modelling the link between the factor and economic variables explicitly, or estimating these links ex-post (like in the factor model).
4. Conclusion

- We study a panel of six bilateral U.S. dollar real exchange rates using a principal factor and a state-space model.

- Key insights:
  1. U.S. shocks are an important role in explaining exchange rates over the 2002-2007 period.
  2. U.S. fiscal shocks seem to have played an important role in the recent (2002-2007) generalized depreciation of the U.S. dollar.
  3. Commodity prices help explain the behaviour of commodity currencies, including Canada.