

Non-linear relationship between real commodity price volatilities
and real effective exchange rate : the case of
commodity-exporting countries

Salem Boubakri, Cyriac Guillaumin, Alexandre Silanine

Cahier de recherche du Creg, n° 2019.01

Janvier 2019

Non-linear relationship between real commodity price volatilities and real effective exchange rate: The case of commodity-exporting countries

Salem Boubakri^{*}

Cyriac Guillaumin^{**}

Alexandre Silanine^{***}

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to contribute to the existing literature by exploring the relationship between the real commodity price volatilities and the real effective exchange rates (REER) of commodity-exporting countries, taking into account the transmission channel of financial market integration. To this end, we consider a sample of 40 commodity-exporting countries subdivided into 4 panels: food and beverages, energy, metals, and raw materials. Our results highlight that the relationship between commodity prices and REER is non-linear and depends on the degree of financialization of the commodity market. Specifically, when a country is poorly integrated financially, the volatility of the real commodity price has a strong and negative impact on the variation in REER. However, for periods when a country is better integrated financially, we observe a decrease in the impact of real commodity prices on REER.

Keywords: real commodity prices index, commodity-exporting countries, real effective exchange rate, financial integration, panel smooth transition model.

JEL classification: C23, F31, F36, Q43.

^{*} Paris-Sorbonne University of Abu Dhabi, B.O.B 38044, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Email: salem.boubakri@psuad.ac.ae.

^{**} (Corresponding author) University Grenoble Alpes, 1241 rue des résidences, BP 47, 38040 Grenoble, France. E-mail: cyriac.guillaumin@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr.

^{***} Paris-Sorbonne University of Abu Dhabi, B.O.B 38044, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Email: silanine.alexandre@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

For countries in which the majority of revenue emanates from export activities, the real effective exchange rate (REER) appears to be a crucial variable in determining trade capabilities. The REER measures the real value of a specific currency of a given country against its main trade partners. In addition, working on the fluctuation in REER allows a comprehensive study, as the REER does not fluctuate randomly and is expected to react to certain macroeconomic variables, which have been found to be a key determinant of its dynamics in the medium term. However, in the literature there are many different views and no consensus regarding the main factors impacting exchange rates. The empirical research on this topic has evolved over time and evidenced many results based on different approaches to monetary factors, or to other factors such as volatilities in world prices for domestic exports. Engle et al. (2007) found evidence that monetary models help to forecast changes in exchange rates, and therefore that exchange rates do not follow a random walk.²

For the special case of net commodity-exporting countries, almost all are developing economies, an extensive literature has focused on the determinants of their real exchange rate. They provide evidence that the real price of commodity exports is the preponderant factor in the determination of the real exchange rate of these countries (Cashin et al., 2004). For more developed commodity-exporting countries, such as Canada and Australia, previous studies have found evidence of correspondence between movements in the price of commodities and changes in their real exchange rates.³ In addition, in the early 2000s, Chen and Rogoff (2003) found a positive link between the price of commodities and the real exchange rate of commodity-exporting countries, which led to the denomination of “commodity currencies”. This denomination is widely used nowadays: for example, the Forex market uses it to gather currencies from commodity exporters whose economies are developed, such as Australia and Canada, as well as a number of currencies issued by emerging commodity exporters.

² See also, for example, Morana (2009).

³ See, among others, Gruen and Wilkinson (1994) and Amano and van Norden (1995).

Furthermore, the intensification of practices such as portfolio rebalancing and hedging has led to a growing impact in the financialization of the commodity markets on the determination of their prices. Indeed, the volume of crude oil futures traded on the New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX) has more than quintupled since the early 2000s (Fratzscher et al., 2014). Therefore, the REER of some countries may be impacted more depending on whether they are more or less integrated financially. In addition, investment funds, which are most likely to impact commodity prices by their actions, as a result of the high purchasing power they possess, tend to buy their futures commodity contracts based on commodity price indices. Consequently, we should be able to capture most of the effect generated by the financialization of the commodity markets by selecting the commodity price indices in respect to the main type of commodity exported by the different countries.

In this paper, our goal is to contribute to the existing literature by exploring the non-linear impact that the volatility of real commodity price indices may have on REER variations when analysing commodity-exporting countries, by considering the degree of financial integration as one of the most important transmission channels. Indeed, considering the growing financialization of the commodity markets, it seems that the level of financial integration of a country may play a role in the transmission channel, from commodity prices to the REER. Moreover, the existing literature focuses mainly on the impact of oil price volatility on the REER of energy-exporting countries. Our aim is to fill the existing gap in the current literature in different ways. First, we extend our study to many types of commodity, and not only to the oil market, in order to take into account the heterogeneity that may exist across countries and their reaction to the dynamics of the transmission channel. To this end, we subdivide our commodity-exporting countries into four panels: food and beverages, energy, metals, and raw materials. Second, as our main variable of interest is the volatility of the commodity price indices, each panel will be respectively linked to a different index in adequacy, with the main type of commodity exported by the countries included in the panel. Third, we test a new transmission channel linked to the financial market, the degree of financial integration, to consider the growing financialization of the commodity markets. To check the robustness of our results,

we test alternative measures of the degree of financial integration, such as M2/GDP, private credit/GDP and FDI/GDP. To the best of our knowledge, no previous studies have included the degree of financial integration as the transmission channel in the relationship between commodity prices and REER.

We consider a sample of 40 commodity-exporting countries, subdivided into 4 panels, according to the main type of commodity exported, in order to account for potential heterogeneity between panels. We rely on a panel smooth transition regression (PSTR) model proposed by González et al. (2005, 2017) in order to consider the non-linear impact of the volatility of the commodity price indices on the real effective exchange rate variations of commodity-exporting countries. Our results highlight that the relationship between commodity prices and REER is non-linear and depends on the degree of financialization of the commodity markets. Specifically, when a country is poorly integrated financially, the volatility of the commodity price has a strong and negative impact on the variation in REER. However, for periods when a country is better integrated financially, we observe a decrease in the impact of commodity prices on REER. Our findings highlight a clear behaviour when considering financial integration as a transmission channel. The robustness tests show that the volatility of the commodity price index appears to be a significant determinant of variations in REER using the commodity terms of trade as another kind of transition channel. However, the results are mixed and the impact is not significant for some panels (food and beverages, regime 2; metals, regime 1). Therefore, our results provide evidence of the increasing relevance of the financial channel, due to the growth of the financialization of the commodity markets.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the existing literature. Section 3 describes the econometric methodology used. Section 4 describes the data and its statistical properties. Section 5 is devoted to commenting on the results found and specification tests. Section 6 concludes.

2. Literature review

In the early 2000s, following the surge in the commodity price index, authors contributed to the existing literature by studying the link between the real exchange rate and terms of trade of commodity-exporting

countries. The positive link found between the two variables led to the denomination of “commodity currencies” (Chen and Rogoff, 2003; Cashin et al., 2004). Commodity terms of trade are usually calculated as real commodity prices by deflating their value by the US consumer price index – as they are denominated in US dollars – or they can be deflated by the manufactured unit value of industrialized countries. This transformation is designed to reflect more accurately the exogenous terms of trade shocks compared to the usual export-to-import ratio. In their study, Chen and Rogoff (2003) focused on three commodity-exporting countries, namely Australia, Canada and New-Zealand, and they found evidence of a strong and stable relationship between the real commodity prices and the REER. For Australia and New Zealand, they found evidence of a strong and stable correlation between the world commodity prices – which are denominated in US dollars – and the REER. Furthermore, their findings are less robust for Canada, which could indicate that the REER of Canada is suffering less from commodity price fluctuations.

As crude oil is the most exchanged commodity worldwide in terms of volume, many studies have focused on the relationship between crude oil prices and exchange rates.⁴ Basher et al. (2012) used a SVAR model for some emerging markets and provided evidence of the short-term effects of oil price shocks on exchange rates. More specifically, a positive oil price shock leads to an immediate decrease in the trade-weighted exchange rate. This result has a statistically significant impact for approximately three months. Beckmann and Czudaj (2013b) identified that fluctuations in nominal oil prices generate real exchange rate effects. Fratzscher et al. (2014) focused on daily data, and they found that a 10% increase in the price of oil leads to a depreciation in the US dollar effective exchange rate by 0.28%, while a 1% US dollar depreciation causes oil prices to rise by 0.73%. Furthermore, Dauvin (2014) detected evidence of a positive long-term relationship between energy prices and the real effective exchange rate of energy-exporting countries: a 10% increase in energy prices led to a 2.5% appreciation in their domestic currency. In a more recent study based on a Markov-switching approach, Basher et al. (2016) showed that oil demand shocks have stronger

⁴ See, for example, Coudert and Mignon (2016) for a literature review.

effects on oil-exporter exchange rates compared to oil supply shocks. The authors found evidence of exchange rate appreciation pressures in oil-exporting economies after oil demand shocks.

Nevertheless, Gomes (2016) found that for oil-exporting countries the price of oil affects their real exchange rate, only if US dollar appreciation does not reach a high level. Furthermore, using a structural VAR model, Buetzer et al. (2016) studied the response of the exchange rates of oil-exporting countries to various shocks in real oil prices. They found no systematic evidence that the domestic currencies of oil-exporting countries appreciate after oil shocks.

Therefore, several studies in the previous literature have shown that there exists a significant and close link between oil prices and the real exchange rate. However, as highlighted by recent research, some have queried this relationship. To discuss this issue further, we now focus on the nature of the relationship (linear versus non-linear) between commodity prices and the REER. Previously, some studies have tried to elucidate how the volatility of commodity prices could be transmitted to the REER. For instance, Krugman (1983) and Golub (1983), among others, used a three-country framework to introduce the concept of the wealth effect channel through petrodollar recycling. This theoretical concept was developed in order to describe how oil-producing countries use the revenue from their oil exports, and also to describe its impact on the exchange rate. The main findings were that, in the short term, an oil price increase will significantly appreciate the US dollar. This appreciation in the US dollar can be explained by oil-exporting countries reinvesting their revenues in US dollar assets. This reinvestment will lead to a growth in demand for US dollar assets that will strengthen the dollar rate. However, the long-term reaction of the US dollar compared to other currencies is determined by the dependence of the US on oil imports relative to the weight of US exports to oil-exporter countries. Furthermore, when an oil price rise occurs, wealth is transferred to oil-exporting countries and will have the effect of improving their current account balance in domestic currency terms.

As a counter-example, Wiegand (2008) studied the mechanism of petrodollar recycling and its importance for emerging market economies. However, he highlighted that if the relative importance of deposit flows

differs between emerging countries, they will experience a crash in funding in the event of a drop in oil prices. Consequently, the currencies of oil-exporting countries tend to appreciate, while the currencies of oil importers tend to depreciate in real effective terms following a rise in oil prices (Beckmann and Czudaj, 2013a).

In more recent studies, authors have considered other channels that could justify the impact of commodity prices on exchange rates. Indeed, Amano and Van Norden (1998) considered the commodity terms of trade as one of the channels that could support the impact of oil prices on exchange rates. Moreover, Cashin et al. (2004) studied the relationship between the commodity terms of trade and the real exchange rate in 58 developed and developing countries. They discovered, in approximately one-third of the 58 commodity-exporting countries that they analysed, that the commodity terms of trade affect the REER. The authors also highlighted that in the majority of commodity currencies it is the real exchange rate that will adjust in order to restore the long-term equilibrium in real commodity prices. This phenomenon can be explained by the terms of trade of commodity-exporting countries being driven by the prices of the commodities they export (Coudert et al., 2015). Therefore, commodity prices are a fundamental determinant value for their nominal exchange rate (Chen et al., 2010). A clear demonstration of this process could be that higher prices in commodities will improve the terms of trade for commodity exporters, resulting in an appreciation of their currency without affecting their trade account.

To support this theory, Dauvin (2014) used a PSTR non-linear model to provide evidence of the existence of a threshold level beyond which the real effective exchange rate of commodity exporters responds to oil price volatility via the terms of trade channel. When the oil market is highly volatile, the terms of trade become an important driver of the real exchange rate of commodity-exporting countries. The study of Coudert et al. (2015) corroborates this result, as it highlights the commodity terms of trade as a significant driver of exchange-rate variations when the oil price is highly volatile. Specifically, the authors divided the countries by main exported commodities, and demonstrated that changes in the terms of trade are significant in regimes with high volatility, especially for groups of energy and metal commodities.

Furthermore, since the mid-2000s, researchers have focused on the financialization of the commodity markets, specifically in the energy sector. Indeed, it appears that the growth in the volume of commodity markets due to its financialization could justify consideration of the financial markets as an important channel when analysing the effect of commodity price volatilities on exchange rates. Fratzscher et al. (2014) displayed the growing relevance of this financial channel, as the volume of crude oil futures traded on NYMEX has more than quintupled since the early 2000s. This may be due to the intensification of recent practices such as portfolio rebalancing and hedging, in respect to the development of commodity futures (Domanski and Heath, 2007). Consequently, the rise in commodity futures has introduced an arbitrage between financial assets and commodity contracts. Coudert and Mignon (2016) dispense a comprehensive justification of the negative relationship between the US dollar and commodity prices due to the growth of financialization of the commodity markets. They confirm that the negative relationship between the two variables is derived from the fact that, if the dollar is expected to increase, then commodities are less alluring to investors. Equity markets may also play a key role in the foundation of oil prices: a positive equity market shock will generate a growth in the expected income of listed firms, and increase global economic activity, which will engender a rise in oil prices. Finally, Büyükşahin and Robe (2014) found empirical evidence of growing cross-market correlations between equity returns and commodity returns caused by speculators. As demonstrated, the previous literature has focused on two main ideas. First, the majority has paid particular attention to the relationship between oil price fluctuations and exchange rates. However, other types of commodity prices, such as metals, food and beverages, and raw materials, can also play an important role as fundamental determinants of real exchange rates in their respective exporting countries. In this study, our objective is to extend the analysis to other types of commodity:⁵ energy (oil, gas and coal), metals (copper, aluminium, iron, ore, tin, nickel, zinc, lead and uranium), food and beverages, and raw materials (timber, cotton, wool, rubber and hides). The commodity-exporting countries that belong to the

⁵ As mentioned previously, Coudert et al. (2015) have studied the relationship between terms of trade and real exchange rates for 69 commodity-producing countries (energy, metals, food and beverages, raw materials) using a non-linear approach. However, they included a different transmission channel linked to oil price volatilities.

same panel can be heterogeneous based on the type of main commodity exported by the country. Second, the literature has shown that the impact of commodity prices on the exchange rate, if it exists, can be non-linear through the transmission channel of the commodity terms of trade or oil price fluctuations. In our investigation the relationship between these commodity price indices and REER is studied using a non-linear approach, while considering financial market integration as a potential transmission channel.

3. Econometric methodology: the PSTR framework

To evaluate the potential relationship between the commodity price index and the real effective exchange rate, different methodologies may be followed. The first method consists of using a causality test or cointegration relationship, which tests a short- and a long-term link between commodity markets and exchange rates. These tests account for a linear relationship and do not take into account the transmission channel of the impact between the two markets (i.e. exchange rate market and commodity market). The second methodology consists of explicitly modelling the non-linearity, using a panel smooth transition regression (PSTR) model proposed by González et al. (2005, 2017). According to this specification, the regression coefficients are allowed to vary across countries, and with time, depending on the commodity market index and the transition variable. More precisely, the observations are divided into two regimes delimited by a threshold reached by the transition variable, with estimated coefficients that vary depending on the considered regime. With this methodology, countries can be distinguished from one another based on the value of the transition variable. Our PSTR specification only focuses on the short-term dynamics of the relationship between REER and the explanatory variables.⁶ Denoting the dependent variable with $\Delta REER$, the variation of the real effective exchange rate, the PSTR model is given by:

$$\Delta REER_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \beta_0 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} + [\beta_1 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} * F(S_{i,t}; \gamma, c)] + \varphi z_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

⁶ Indeed, the previous literature found clear evidence of a short-term relationship between commodity price shocks (mainly in the oil sector) and exchange rate fluctuations (see, for example, Ferraro et al., 2011; Basher et al., 2012).

for $t = 1, \dots, T$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$, with t denoting time and i the country. Furthermore, α_i denotes the country fixed effects and $\Delta ComPI_{i,t}$ stands for the volatility of the commodity price index. The commodity price index volatility is proxied by the absolute value of the commodity price variation.⁷ F is a transition function, $S_{i,t}$ stands for the transition variable, defined here by the financial integration level, $z_{i,t}$ is a vector of control variables, expressed in first differences, representing the fundamental determinants of REER,⁸ and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ is an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) error term. Transition function $F(S_{i,t}; \gamma, c)$ is a continuous function of $S_{i,t}$ and is normalized to be bounded between 0 and 1, and these extreme values are associated with regression coefficients β_0 and $\beta_0 + \beta_1$. This transition function is given by (González et al., 2005):

$$F(S_{i,t}; \gamma, c) = \left(1 + \exp(-\gamma \prod_{j=1}^m (S_{it} - c_j))\right)^{-1} \quad (2)$$

where c_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, m$) are the threshold parameters ($c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_m$) and γ is the slope parameter of the transition function. According to González et al. (2005), in practice, it is usually sufficient to consider $m = 1$ (logistic) and $m = 2$ (logistic quadratic). In the case of $m = 1$, the dynamics is asymmetric and the two extreme regimes are associated with low and high values of the transition variable, where the change is centred around the threshold (c_1). In the case of $m = 2$, the dynamics is symmetric, and the transition function has its minimum at $(c_1 + c_2)/2$, and attains the value of 1 at both low and high values of the transition variable.

In our case, the main transition variable is the financial development level ($M2/GDP$). Depending on the realization of this variable, the relationship between the real effective exchange rate and the commodity price index volatility is specified by the regression coefficients β_0 (in the first regime) and $\beta_0 + \beta_1$ (in the second regime). In our model, depending on the level of financial development, the commodity price index volatility has a different impact on the real effective exchange rate (i.e. appreciation or depreciation). This

⁷ We also calculated the implied volatility from a GARCH (1,1) model. Results, available upon request from the authors, are very close to the proxy used.

⁸ Note that since our focus is on the relationship between commodity prices and real exchange rate, we assume that only the commodity price index coefficient varies depending on the transmission variable values.

impact varies between commodity-exporting countries and time according to the value taken by the transition function, as follows:

$$\frac{\delta \Delta REER_{i,t}}{\delta \Delta Compl_{i,t}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 F(S_{i,t}; \gamma, c) \quad \forall m = (1,2) \quad (3)$$

The estimation methodology proposed by González et al. (2005) is conducted in two steps. In the first step, a within transformation is done to eliminate the individual fixed effects, α_i , by removing individual-specific means. In a second step, the parameters of the transition function γ_j and c_j are estimated by applying non-linear least squares (NLLS) to the transformed model. Thus, for given values of $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and \hat{c}_j , it is possible to estimate the parameters α and β . However, the convergence issue of this estimation procedure is greatly dependent upon the chosen starting values of γ_j and c_j . For our model, it is often suggested that sensible starting values can be obtained by means of a grid search across the parameters in the transition function. Given these grids, OLS regressions are performed for all combinations of the initial values to estimate the corresponding parameters α and β . After this procedure, two misspecification tests are conducted to evaluate the PSTR estimation: (i) parameter constancy over time, and (ii) no remaining non-linearity.⁹

4. Data

4.1. Sample of countries

We consider yearly data for a panel of 40 commodity-exporting countries spanning from 1980 to 2016. The list of countries is given in Table A.1 (in the Appendix), together with the main type of commodity exported by each one, which are – except for energy-exporting countries – derived from Cashin et al. (2004) and used for the construction of our panels (see Table A.2 in the Appendix). Among the different panels, the energy panel is the largest, with 12 energy-exporting countries, of which 6 countries belong to OPEC (Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Venezuela), 2 are other Gulf countries (Bahrain and Oman), 2 are leading oil exporters (Mexico and Colombia) and another 2 are

⁹ The details of these two misspecification tests can be found in the paper of González et al. (2005).

gas- and oil-exporting countries (Norway and Canada). This is followed by the food and beverages panel, in which 5 are food-exporting countries and 6 are beverage-exporting countries. The two other panels are raw materials and metals, which are respectively composed of 9 and 8 exporting countries. We decided to discard and remove some countries derived from the initial list of 52 countries of Cashin et al. (2004) based on the lack of available data or extensive periods of war, which would have distorted the results (Syria, Libya, Central African Republic, etc.).

The dependent variable is the variation of the real effective exchange rate (REER hereafter) and is provided by the Bank of International Settlements and Bruegel databases.

The control variables are derived from the previous empirical studies on REER and main determinants. Following the previous literature, for example, Clark and MacDonald (1998), Chinn (2005) or Ricci et al. (2008), we retain three main control variables as determinants of the real effective exchange rate: (i) the relative productivity in the traded-goods sectors (relative to the non-traded goods one) as a proxy for the Balassa-Samuelson effect, (ii) net foreign asset position in percentage of GDP, and (iii) commodity terms of trade.

The Balassa-Samuelson effect, or productivity differential, states that a country experiencing high productivity growth in tradable goods, relative to non-tradable goods, will experience a growth in wages (in both sectors). It will inexorably give rise to higher prices in non-tradable goods. Consequently, the real exchange rate appreciates. The Balassa-Samuelson effect is approximated by the GDP per capita measured in purchasing power parity (PPP) relative to the trading partners. The weights (w_j) correspond to the shares in the world PPP GDP per capita, calculated on average over the period 1980-2016. Both variables, PPP GDP and GDP data, are extracted from the IMF International Financial Statistics (IFS) database.¹⁰

$$BS_{it} = \frac{PPP\ GDP\ capita_{i,t}}{\prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^{137} PPP\ GDP\ capita_{j,t}^{(w_j)}} \quad (9)$$

where $w_j = GDP_j / \sum_{k=1}^{137} GDP_k$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{137} w_j = 1$.

¹⁰ For robustness check, we also used Balassa-Samuelson effect data from the *EQCHANGE* database (Cepii). Results, available upon request from the authors, are very similar.

The net foreign asset position (NFA) refers to the value of the sum of foreign assets held by monetary authorities and deposit money banks, less the value of domestic assets owned by foreigners. It is expressed in percentage points of GDP. The net foreign asset position is a measure of indebtedness, indicating whether or not the country is a net creditor or debtor to the rest of the world. The NFA position can drive changes in exchange rates, since a country that faces a growing current account deficit needs to increase its trade surpluses, which can be done by depreciating its exchange rate. Another reason that could justify the impact of the net foreign asset position is that the currencies of countries with a significant negative NFA position and growing current account deficits may appear to be vulnerable to currency speculators, who may seek to drive it lower. The NFA series are taken from Lane and Milesi-Ferretti's database for the period 1980-2011.¹¹ For all the subsequent years (2012 to 2016), we computed the variable by adding the previous NFA position to the contemporaneous current account:

$$NFA_{i,t} = NFA_{i,t-1} + CA_{i,t} \quad (10)$$

and considered the variable as a percentage of GDP. The current account and GDP (in US dollars) data were taken from the IMF World Economic Outlook (WEO).

The commodity terms of trade are calculated in the same way as in Cashin et al. (2004). Consequently, the terms of trade are a weighted average price of the three main commodities exported by the country, deflated by the manufactured unit value (MUV).¹² Therefore, the commodity terms of trade are expressed as:

$$TOT_{i,t}^{com} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^3 share_i^k \times p_t^k}{MUV_t} \quad (11)$$

where $share_i^k$ is the share of commodity k among the three main commodities exported by country i (they are displayed in Table A.2 in the appendix), p_t^k is the price of commodity k extracted from the World Bank's GEM database, and MUV_t is the manufactured unit value extracted from the IMF World Economic Outlook (WEO) database.

¹¹ <http://www.philiplane.org/EWN.html>. See Lane and Milesi-Ferretti (2007).

¹² For oil-exporting countries, the terms of trade are calculated as the oil price deflated by the manufactured unit value (MUV). This has been done for the 11 oil-exporting countries where the oil price stands for 100% of the weight.

Following Levine et al. (2000), the degree of financial integration is measured by a standard indicator, that is, the ratio M2 to GDP, and taken from Datastream. We also use two other indicators as robustness checks of the financial integration degree, such as the ratio of private credit to GDP and the ratio of foreign direct investment to GDP. These two ratios are taken from the World Bank database (*World Development Indicators*). Table A.3 (in the Appendix) provides some descriptive statistics on our data.

4.2. The commodity price index

In order to investigate the non-linear relationship between commodity price volatilities and real exchange rates, we selected the commodity price index in accordance with the main type of commodity exported by the countries present in our panels. All price indices were extracted from the IMF International Financial Statistics (IFS) database. For the energy panel, we used the “energy price index”, which includes the crude oil (petroleum), natural gas and coal price indices.¹³ For the food and beverages panel, we opted for the “food and beverage price index”, which combines the food and the beverage price indices. For the metals group, we selected the “metals price index”, which incorporates the copper, aluminium, iron, ore, tin, nickel, zinc, lead and uranium price indices. Finally, for the raw materials panels, we chose the “agricultural raw materials index”, which incorporates the timber, cotton, wool, rubber and hides price indices. If we take a closer look at the descriptive statistics of the yearly variation in price indices, we can highlight some interesting findings. The results are reported in Table 1 and highlight that the average of the energy price index is nearly as high as that of the metals, which makes these two indices the ones with the highest average yearly variation. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the raw materials panel is the lowest encountered in all the indices, with a value of 11.54%.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

¹³ For oil-exporting countries, the oil price index is calculated as a simple average of US dollar prices in three major markets: Brent, Dubai, West Texas.

Additionally, Figure 1 displays the evolution and yearly variations of the four commodity indices used in our study. Figure 1 allows us to discern some evidence of high volatility for some periods.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

For the food and beverages index, we can observe three major peaks in the volatility of the index: in 1987 (-24%), in 2008 (+24%) and finally in 2011 (+19.8%). The highest decrease in 1987 is mainly due to the price of coffee dropping strongly (-42%). The spike in prices in 2008 can be explained by the world food price crisis (2007-8). The initial cause of the food price crisis was droughts in grain-producing countries in late 2006, which, combined with increasing demand from the Asian population, resulted in a decrease in the world's food stockpiles. This diminution of the world's reserves was coupled with an increase in oil prices, which led to a reduction in the profitability of agricultural production. The increase of 2011 was mainly due to cereal prices, which rose by 35%.

Turning to the raw materials index, there are two major spikes in variations in the commodity index. The first one occurred in 1987, and was mainly due to cotton prices increasing by more than 60% in one year. The second major spike occurred in 2011 (+33%), mostly as a result of the increase in cotton prices (+45%) to an all-time high for more than 150 years. This spike in cotton prices can be explained by floods in major cotton-producing areas in Australia, Pakistan and China, which reduced the forecast supply, and by a soar in demand by China. The metals price index has experienced multiple positive shocks over the period, with the most significant taking place in 1987 (+54%) and 2006 (+56%). The surge in the metal price index in 1987 was due to a world supply shortage in 1987 of aluminium, zinc and nickel. In addition, the lead industry witnessed a growth in demand due to an increase in the production of lead-based batteries. In 2006, the increase was mainly caused by zinc, which experienced a production deficit for the third consecutive year in 2006. Copper played a major role in the surge in the metal index, and the sharp rise in prices coincided with an assessment made by industry analysts of the near-term availability of copper supply.

Finally, the energy price index experienced various positive and negative shocks. We propose focusing on the three largest cases of variations, which took place in 1986 (-48%), 2000 (+55%) and, more recently, in 2015 (-44%). Starting with the year 1986, the cause of the sudden decrease in the index was the result of a decision by Saudi Arabia and some of its neighbours to increase their share of the oil market. The positive shock appeared in 2000 because of the decision taken in April 1999 by the 10 members of OPEC to reduce their production of oil by 1.72 million barrels per day in order to increase oil prices. This decision, combined with the growing demand emanating from East Asian countries, pushed oil prices up. Finally, in more recent years, the energy price index decreased by 44% in 2015. Numerous factors contributed to the drop in oil prices experienced in late 2014, which carried on into 2015. The first factor is the increased production of countries such as Canada and the United States of America, which were seeking to counter the rise in oil prices because of the negative effect on their economies. As a result of their actions, world production increased, while the demand for oil was reduced by China and other large developing economies such as India and Brazil. Furthermore, the price of gas followed the same trajectory. The first factor was that, although oil and gas are not substitutes for each other, gas prices are linked to oil prices. In addition, demand was lower than expected as a result of the low cost of coal and the fall in the cost of renewable energy, which made gas a less attractive option for the energy industry.

5. Results

5.1. PSTR estimation

The first step in the modelling procedure consists of testing the null hypothesis of linearity against the PSTR alternative using LM and F tests, as explained by González et al. (2005, 2017). In our study, the linearity test is implemented taking into account the transition variable, which is the degree of financial integration measured by $M2/GDP$. If the linearity is rejected, it means that the impact of commodity price index volatility on the real exchange rate is different, depending on whether the financial integration level is low or high. The results are displayed in Table 2 and, as expected, the null hypothesis of linearity is

rejected in favour of the PSTR alternative with two regimes. This finding highlights that commodity price volatility impacts the real exchange rate differently, depending on the level of financial integration.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

We now proceed to the estimation of our PSTR specification for the whole sample and the four panels. The main objective of our first estimation is to capture the change in the behavioural relationship between the volatility of the commodity price indices and the variations in real effective exchange rates, using the degree of financial integration as the transition variable. The first regime corresponds to the periods when the countries under study are poorly integrated financially. On the contrary, the second regime covers the periods when these countries are better integrated financially. Table 3 presents the PSTR estimation results.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The results show, for the whole sample, that the response of the REER to the commodity price index volatilities is different between the two regimes. In the first regime, when the financial integration level is low (less than 0.32), the REER is negatively impacted in the case of increasing volatility of the commodity price index. On the other hand, better financial integration reduces the impact of price volatility on the REER, and the estimated coefficient becomes positive (0.05) but is low (tending to zero) compared to the first regime. For the other determinants of the REER, only the net foreign assets and the Balassa-Samuelson have a significant effect.

For the two panels of energy and metals, values of \hat{c} , which is the estimated value of the threshold, are very similar, 0.32 and 0.33 respectively. For the other two panels, the value of the threshold is lower: 0.27 for the raw materials panel, and 0.17 for the food and beverages panel. A detailed analysis of the estimated coefficients for each of the panels presented in Table 3 provides an insight into the response of the real exchange rates to the explanatory variables. We note that, since our objective is to study the impact of

commodity price volatilities on the real exchange rate, depending on the level of financial integration, we only allowed the commodity price coefficient to vary depending on the values of the transition variable.

For the food and beverages panel, our results show that the volatility of the prices of the commodity index has a very significant effect on the real effective exchange rate. Indeed, both coefficients (in the first and second regimes) are highly significant. In the first regime, the estimated coefficient is negative. Consequently, an increase in the volatility of the commodity prices will have the effect of strongly depreciating the REER for the periods when a country is poorly integrated financially. In other words, when the volatility of the prices increases by 10%, the REER will decrease by 6.15%. In addition, in the second regime, for the periods when a country is better integrated financially, the coefficient is still negative but smaller and tending to 0. Indeed, an increase of 10% in the volatility of the prices will result in a small depreciation of the REER by 0.82%.

In more details, for the energy panel, we can highlight that the estimated value of the threshold (\hat{c}) is greater than in the food and beverages group. This could be explained by numerous facts, one being that energy producers have globally higher financial integration, which is supported by the median value of this variable (0.45) compared to the food and beverages group (0.32). Another explanation is that financial integration differs between both groups according to the needs of technology for the production of their commodity, which is greater in energy-exporting countries. Taking a closer look at the data, approximately 81% of the observations in the energy panel belong to the second regime (high degree of financial integration). Considering the estimated coefficient of the volatility of the price of the energy index, we once again find very significant results, with a confidence level of 99% in both regimes. In the first regime, a 10% increase in the volatility of the price index leads to a depreciation in REER by -2.72%. In the second regime, that is, for the period when the countries are better integrated financially, we can observe a positive relationship between the volatility of the energy prices and the variations in REER.

Turning to metals, the estimated value of threshold level (\hat{c}) is approximately 0.33. During the studied period, roughly 59% of the observations belong to the second regime. The transition value cuts our

observations into two groups, allowing a clear contrast to be seen between the periods when a country is better integrated financially (regime 2) and periods when integration is lower (regime 1). Considering the volatility of the metals prices index, we can observe that our estimated coefficient is less significant than in other panels. In the second regime, which is significant at 95%, we find an unusual effect of the volatility of the price index on REER. There is a strong and positive relationship between both variables, unlike in other panels, where the volatility of the index prices generally has a limited impact on REER variations, as they tend to 0 in the second regime. Here, the estimated coefficient is almost 0.27. Consequently, the volatility of the prices of the index is a major determinant of REER variations in the periods when a country is well integrated financially.

Focusing on the last panel, namely raw materials, the threshold value (\hat{c}) occurs at 0.27, and approximately 43% of the observations in the panel belong to the second regime. Like the energy and the food and beverages panels, the volatility of the commodity prices index plays a significant role in the variations in REER. Both estimated coefficients – for the first and second regimes – are highly significant. In the first regime, the coefficient is negative and vigorous. If the volatility of the prices increases by 10% this results in a depreciation in REER by 3.9%. In the second regime, the elasticity of the relationship is weaker. An increase of 10% in the volatility of the commodity prices index will lead to a depreciation in REER of only 0.2%. Consequently, we can state that, for the periods when a country is better integrated financially, the impact of the volatility of the commodity prices is minimized.

Shedding light on the three variables of control, which are not subject to the transition in our PSTR specification, we can first observe that the commodity terms of trade are not a significant determinant of variations in the real effective exchange rate for all panels in the short-term. These results can be supported by the previous literature, where it has been found that, for example, in the case of the energy and metals panels, changes in terms of trade are only a significant determinant of variations in REER for the periods when oil prices are subject to high volatility (Coudert et al., 2015). For the net foreign asset position – which reflects the indebtedness of a country – the estimated coefficient is highly significant and negative

for all panels. For example, in the case of the energy panel, this negative relationship can be explained by the well-known petrodollar recycling effect. Indeed, if a country tends to hold a larger amount of foreign assets, a better NFA would have a negative impact on its real effective exchange rate, as the foreign currencies would be requested more. Finally, the Balassa-Samuelson effect is significant and has a positive effect on REER variations only for the food and beverages panel. Indeed, according to the literature, a country experiencing high productivity growth in tradable goods, relative to non-tradable goods, should experience a growth in wages, which would result in an appreciation of its real effective exchange rate.

To sum up, it is evident that the volatility of the prices of the commodity index is a very significant determinant of the variations in REER for all the panels (except for the metals panel in the first regime). In addition, we can find a common impact of commodity price volatility on the variation in the real effective exchange rate. In the first regime, that is, for the periods when the commodity-exporting countries are poorly integrated financially, we can distinguish a negative relationship for all the panels. Therefore, for the periods when a country is poorly integrated financially, the volatility of the prices in the index will have the effect of depreciating the real effective exchange rate. On the contrary, for the periods when a country is better integrated financially, the volatility of the prices in the index will have a lower impact on the real exchange rate. Indeed, in the second regime, the coefficients are positive in most cases but tend to be closer to 0 compared to the first regime. Finally, it is evident that the transmission channel of financial integration level plays a key role in better understanding the existing non-linear relationship. Our findings are consistent with previous studies (Fratzscher et al., 2014; Coudert and Mignon, 2016) and support the idea that the growth in volume of the commodity markets due to its financialization can justify consideration of the financial market integration as an important transmission channel when analysing the effect of commodity price volatilities on real exchange rates variations.

5.2. Robustness checks

5.2.1. Other measures of financial integration degree

As explained previously, taking into account the financial channel in the investigation of the relationship between commodity price index volatilities and real exchange rate variations depends on the recent growth in financialization of the commodity markets. As this process has been investigated only recently, the previous empirical results may include some drawbacks linked to data set accuracy, as well as the measure used to evaluate the degree of financial integration.

Methods used to measure the degree of financial integration are widely studied by the empirical literature and include different proxies that can be *de jure* measures based on legal restrictions (Kose et al. 2006), *de facto* measures based on quantity approach (Lane and Milesi-Ferretti, 2007), and price-based approach.¹⁴ Financial integration refers to a large set of indicators (IMF, 2006; Čihák et al., 2013). Beyond this large choice of measures, and the advantages and drawbacks that can be discussed, unfortunately working on a very large sample of 40 commodity-exporting countries reduces the number of measures that can be used to assess the degree of financial integration. To investigate the robustness of our results, and based on the data set availability, we select the following two financial indicators: private credit to GDP and foreign direct investment to GDP. These two measures allow us to test another financial channel when studying the impact of commodity price index volatilities on REER variations. The first indicator is a financial depth measure, defined as the credit issued to the private sector by banks and other financial intermediaries, divided by GDP, and constitutes a measure of general financial intermediary activities provided to the private sector. The second indicator is defined as the sum of equity capital, reinvestment of earnings, other long- and short-term capital, as shown in the balance of payments, divided by GDP, and constitutes an alternative measure of financial integration through international investment positions (Kučerová, 2009). Tables 4 and 5 present the PSTR estimation results. The same model specification is used, including the three variables of control, as in previous sections.

¹⁴ Indicators based on the uncovered interest rate parity and on asset prices. See, for example, Pasricha (2006).

INSERT TABLES 4 AND 5 ABOUT HERE

Globally, the results highlight that our previous findings are robust to alternative measures of financial integration. Indeed, the non-linear relationship is confirmed and the volatility of the prices of the commodity index is a very significant determinant of the variations in REER for all the panels. The results also show a strong and negative relationship in the first regime when the degree of financial integration is low. However, the impact of commodity price index volatilities is reduced, and becomes positive in the second regime when the commodity-exporting countries are better integrated financially. Therefore, the robustness of our findings contribute to the existing literature by highlighting the preponderant role played by financial integration as a transmission channel between the commodity and exchange rate markets.

5.2.2. Is there another transmission channel for the impact of commodity price index volatilities on the REER?

We now investigate the relationship between the volatility of the commodity price indices and the REER using the terms of trade of the commodity markets (ToT^{com}) as a transition variable. Indeed, in the literature, there are many different views and no consensus regarding the main factors impacting exchange rates. Moreover, there are many views about the transmission channels of the relationship between commodity price indices and REER. Indeed, beyond the empirical results found in the previous section we propose to test a second transmission channel of terms of trade. The impact on REER can be linked to different explanatory factors, as well as to different transmission channels.

This second test is important for the interpretation of our results and their robustness. Indeed, previous studies have evidenced that the terms of trade are the preponderant factor in the determination of the real exchange rate of the commodity-exporting countries (Chen and Rogoff, 2003; Cashin et al., 2004). Therefore, as the wealth of commodity-exporting countries largely depends on commodity exports, and as commodity prices are subject to huge fluctuations, the terms of trade are a relevant determinant of their real

exchange rates. The contribution of this test is to check, beyond the financial integration level, whether the trade channel can also be a major factor when studying the relationship between the commodity prices and REER. Indeed, in the previous literature, the introduction of the terms of trade as a transmission channel was tested mainly in the case of the oil sector.

The terms of trade are defined as the ratio of the prices of a country's exports relative to the prices of its imports. Consequently, for commodity-exporting countries, the terms of trade are often approximated as the ratio of the prices of the three main commodities exported by a country, deflated by the manufacture unit value of industrialized countries. Because primary commodities dominate the exports of commodity-exporting countries, fluctuations in world commodity prices have the potential to explain a large share of movements in their terms of trade. Therefore, as the wealth of commodity-exporting countries largely depends on commodity exports, and as commodity prices are subject to huge fluctuations, the terms of trade are a relevant determinant of their real exchange rates.

To examine this matter, as in the previous section, we test the PSTR specification for the whole sample and our four panels: energy, metals, food and beverages, and raw materials. Our aim is to capture whether the transmission of volatility of the price indices on the REER will be greater in periods of low or high volatility of the terms of trade (approximated by the absolute value of the terms of trade variations). As usual, we started by conducting the linearity test against the PSTR alternative. As expected, the null hypothesis of linearity is rejected in favour of the PSTR model with two regimes. This finding highlights that commodity price volatility impacts the real exchange rate differently, depending on the stability of the terms of trade (low versus high volatility).¹⁵ Table 6 displays the PSTR estimation results.

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

First, we can discern that the transition occurs in different ways for the panels. The estimated value of the threshold (\hat{c}) is high for the energy, metals and raw materials panels, compared to the food and beverages

¹⁵ The results of the linearity tests are available upon request from the authors.

panel. The first regime includes periods of low volatility of the terms of trade, and the second regime consequently contains the periods when a country is subject to high volatility in its terms of trade. The results show, for the whole sample, that the response of the REER to the commodity price index volatilities is different between the two regimes. In the first regime, the relationship between the two variables is negative and becomes positive when the threshold value reaches 0.25.

Considering our four panels, we can observe that the volatility of the price index is a significant and negative determinant of the variations in REER during the first regime (except for metals panel). When the terms of trade are stable – lower volatility – an increase in the volatility of the price index will result in a depreciation in REER. On the other hand, in the second regime, for periods when the volatility of the terms of trade is medium to high, the estimated coefficient of volatility of the price index is statistically significant and positive, but the impact is highly reduced compared to the first regime. Focusing our attention on the fundamentals variable, we find some common results with our previous PSTR specification (Table 3). The NFA position is negatively signed, from which we can deduce that positive variations in the NFA position will appreciate the REER. The Balassa-Samuelson effect is correctly signed (positive) and significant. However, variations in the terms of trade are not a significant determinant of variations in REER in the short term.

To sum up, it is evident that, globally, the volatility of the price index appears to be a significant determinant of variations in REER using the commodity terms of trade as another kind of transition channel. Furthermore, similarly to our first PSTR specification, that is, with financial integration as the transition variable, we find that the NFA is a main variable of control, which plays a significant role as a determinant of variations in REER. These results therefore support our previous finding, which is that in the short term, when the NFA position improves, there is a resulting depreciation in REER.

Globally, these robustness tests confirm the non-linear relationship between the volatility of commodity price indices and REER variations, and this relationship can be transmitted through many different channels (financial, trade). Our findings highlight a clear behaviour when considering financial integration as a

transmission channel. However, the results are mixed when considering the terms of trade as a transmission channel. Indeed, for some panels the impact is not significant (food and beverages, regime 2; metals, regime 1), or even less important even in regime 1. Therefore, our findings provide evidence of the growing relevance of the financial channel, due to financialization growth of the commodity markets.

6. Conclusion

The aim of this paper is to study the relationship between the volatility of commodity price indices and real effective exchange rates of 40 commodity-exporting economies between 1980 and 2016 in both the short- and long-terms. The main objective of this study is to investigate the potential asymmetric effects of the level of financial integration of commodity countries on the relationship between commodity price indices and the REER. Indeed, as a result of the growing financialization of the commodity markets, the asymmetrical effect of the volatility of the commodity price indices on the real effective exchange rates of commodity-exporting countries appears to be coherent.

With this in mind, we subdivided our 40 countries into 4 panels, according to the main type of commodity exported, in order to account for potential heterogeneity between panels. We then used a PSTR model in order to consider the potential non-linear effects of the volatility of the commodity price indices on the real effective exchange rate variations of commodity-exporting countries. Our results are significant and show that the short-term dynamics of commodity-exporting countries' real exchange rates are affected by their respective commodity price index. Specifically, based on the PSTR specification, with financial integration as the transmission variable, we found that for the energy, raw materials and food and beverages groups, the volatility of the commodity price index is a significant driver of variations in REER. On the contrary, the results are less robust for the metal panel. Furthermore, for the energy, raw materials and food and beverages groups, we found a common pattern in the estimated coefficients. Indeed, according to our study, for the periods when a country is poorly integrated financially, the increase in volatility of the price index results in a depreciation in REER. On the contrary, based on our results, in the second regime, when a

country is better integrated financially, the estimated coefficients of the price indices tend to be closer to 0. Consequently, when a country is better integrated financially, the volatility of the price index has a limited impact on variations in REER, leading to a possible stabilization of its domestic currency against its trading partners. The noticeable change in the relationship between the volatility of the commodity price index and variations in REER could be explained by the wealth of commodity-exporting countries originating from their commodity exports. Therefore, when a country is poorly integrated financially, the volatility of the commodity price index is experienced as uncertainty and risk. The uncertainty provoked by the fluctuation in prices leads to an amplification of the transmission of the volatility of the commodity price index to the REER. On the contrary, when a country is better integrated financially, a fluctuation in the commodity price index will be less noteworthy for its exchange rates, as it will be able to take measures to restrain its impact. We also tested another PSTR specification, including commodity terms of trade as a transition variable. The results support our assumption that the volatility of commodity terms of trade is an important transmission channel in the non-linear relationship between the volatility of the commodity price indices and the REER variations. In addition, our results showed that in periods of high volatility of the terms of trade, there is a significant and positive relationship between the volatility of the commodity price index and variations in the real effective exchange rates in all the panels except for the energy panel. On the contrary, when volatility is low to average, the estimated coefficients are negatively signed when significant.

To sum up, our results highlight the importance of the financialization channel, when analysing the impact of commodity price fluctuations on the REER of commodity-exporting countries. However, one should not focus on the level of financial integration of a country alone when analysing the relationship between commodity prices and the REER. Indeed, we evidenced that, in periods of high volatility of the terms of trade, the volatility of the price index becomes an important driver of variations in REER. While this research focuses on commodity-exporting countries, further research should aim to capture the role played

by the financialization of commodity markets in the spread of volatility of commodity prices on the REER of commodity-importing countries.

References

- Amano, R. and van Norden, S. (1995). Terms of trade and real exchange rates: the Canadian evidence. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 14(1), pp. 83-104.
- Amano, R. and van Norden, S. (1998). Exchange Rates and Oil Prices. *Review of International Economics*, 6(4), pp. 683-694.
- Basher, S., Haug, A. and Sadorsky, P. (2012). Oil prices, exchange rates and emerging stock markets. *Energy Economics*, 34(1), pp. 227-240.
- Basher, S., Haug, A. and Sadorsky, P. (2016). The impact of oil shocks on exchange rates: A Markov-switching approach. *Energy Economics*, 54, pp. 11-23.
- Beckmann, J. and Czudaj, R. (2013a). Is there a homogeneous causality pattern between oil prices and currencies of oil importers and exporters? *Energy Economics*, 40, pp. 665-678.
- Beckmann, J. and Czudaj, R. (2013b). Oil prices and effective dollar exchange rates. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 27, pp. 621-636.
- Buetzer, S., Habib, M. M. and Stracca, L. 2016. Global exchange rate configurations: do oil shocks matter? *IMF Economic Review*, 64(3), pp. 443-470.
- Büyükkahin, B. and Robe, M. (2014). Speculators, commodities and cross-market linkages. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 42, pp. 38-70.
- Cashin, P., Céspedes, L. and Sahay, R. (2004). Commodity currencies and the real exchange rate. *Journal of Development Economics*, 75(1), pp. 239-268.
- Chen, Y. and Rogoff, K. (2003). Commodity currencies. *Journal of International Economics*, 60(1), pp. 133-160.
- Chen, Y., Rogoff, K. and Rossi, B. (2010). Can Exchange Rates Forecast Commodity Prices? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(3), pp. 1145-1194.
- Chinn, M. D. (2005). A primer on real effective exchange rates: determinants, overvaluation, trade flows and competitive devaluation, *NBER working paper 11521*, National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Čihák, M., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Feyen, E. and Levine, R. (2013). Financial Development in 205 Economies, 1960 to 2010. *NBER working paper 18946*, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Clark, P. and MacDonald, R. (1998). Exchange rates and economic fundamentals: a methodological comparison of BEERs and FEERs. *IMF working paper 98/00*, International Monetary Fund.
- Coudert, V. and Mignon, V. (2016). Reassessing the empirical relationship between the oil price and the dollar. *Energy Policy*, 95, pp. 147-157.
- Coudert, V., Couharde, C. and Mignon, V. (2015). On the impact of volatility on the real exchange rate – terms of trade nexus: Revisiting commodity currencies. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 58, pp. 110-127.
- Dauvin, M. (2014). Energy prices and the real exchange rate of commodity-exporting countries. *International Economics*, 137, pp. 52-72.
- Domanski, D. and Heath, A. (2007). Financial Investors and Commodity Markets. *BIS Quarterly Review*.
- Engle, C. M., Nelson, C. M. and Kenneth, D. W. (2007). Exchange rate models are not as bad as you think. *NBER working paper 13318*, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Ferraro, D., Rogoff, K. and Rossi, B. (2011). Can oil prices forecast exchange rates? *Working paper 11-34*, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.
- Fratzscher, M., Schneider, D. and Van Robays, I. (2014). Oil Prices, Exchange Rates and Asset Prices. *ECB working paper 1689*, European Central Bank.
- Golub, S. (1983). Oil Prices and Exchange Rates. *The Economic Journal*, 93(371), pp. 576-593.
- Gomes, G. (2016). On the impact of dollar movements on oil currencies. *Cepii working paper 2016-11*, Cepii.
- González, A., Teräsvirta, T. and van Dijk, D. (2005). Panel Smooth Transition Regression models. Research Paper 165. *Quantitative Finance Research Centre*, University of Technology.
- González, A., Teräsvirta, T. and van Dijk, D. (2017). Panel Smooth Transition Regression models. CREATES Research Paper 36, *Department of Economics and Business Economics*, Aarhus University.

- Gruen, N. D. and Wilkinson, J. (1994). Australia's Real Exchange Rate – Is it Explained by the Terms of Trade or by Real Interest Differentials? *Economic Record*, 70(209), pp. 204-219.
- IMF. (2006). How do financial systems affect economic cycles? in *World Economic Outlook*, Financial Systems and Economic Cycles, chapter 4, International Monetary Fund.
- Kose, A., Prasad, E., Rogoff, K. and Shang-Jin, W. (2006). Financial globalization: A reappraisal. *IMF working paper 06/189*. International Monetary Fund.
- Krugman, P. (1983). Oil Shocks and Exchange Rate Dynamics. *Exchange rates and international macroeconomics*, pp. 259-284.
- Kučerová, Z. (2009). Measuring Financial Integration in Central Europe through International Investment Positions. *Eastern European Economics*, 47(4), pp. 25-41.
- Lane, P. and Milesi-Ferretti, G. M. (2007). The external wealth of nations mark II: Revised and extended estimates of foreign assets and liabilities, 1970-2004. *Journal of International Economics*, 73(2), pp. 223-250.
- Levine, R., Loayza, N. and Beck, T. (2000). Financial intermediation and growth: causality and causes. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 6(1), pp. 31-77.
- Morana, C. (2009). On the macroeconomic causes of exchange rate volatility. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 25, pp. 328-350.
- Pasricha, G. K. (2006). Survey of literature on covered and uncovered interest parities. *MPRA working paper 22737*. University Library of Munich.
- Ricci, L., Lee, J. and Milesi-Ferretti, G. M. (2008). Real Exchange Rates and Fundamentals: A Cross-Country Perspective. *IMF working paper 08-13*, International Monetary Fund.
- Wiegand, J. (2008). Bank Recycling of Petro Dollars to Emerging Market Economies During the Current Oil Price Boom. *IMF working paper 08-180*, International Monetary Fund.

Appendix

INSERT TABLE A.1 ABOUT HERE

INSERT TABLE A.2 ABOUT HERE

INSERT TABLE A.3 ABOUT HERE

Tables and Figures

Figure 1: Evolution of commodity prices index (base 100: 2005)




Table A.1: List of countries¹⁶

Country	Commodity group	Country	Commodity group
Argentina	Food & Beverages	Niger	Metals
Bahrain	Energy	Norway	Energy
Bolivia	Metals	Oman	Energy
Brazil	Metals	Papua New Guinea	Metals
Canada	Energy & Raw Materials	Paraguay	Food & Beverages
Chile	Metals	Peru	Metals
Colombia	Energy	Philippines	Food & Beverages
Honduras	Food & Beverages	Saudi Arabia	Energy
India	Food & Beverages	Senegal	Raw Materials
Indonesia	Energy	South Africa	Metals
Iran	Energy	Thailand	Food & Beverages
Ivory Coast	Food & Beverages	Togo	Raw Materials
Kenya	Food & Beverages	Tunisia	Raw Materials
Kuwait	Energy	Turkey	Raw Materials
Malawi	Raw Materials	Uganda	Food & Beverages
Malaysia	Food & Beverages	United Arab Emirates	Energy
Mali	Raw Materials	Uruguay	Food & Beverages
Mexico	Energy	Venezuela	Energy
Morocco	Raw Materials	Zambia	Metals
Mozambique	Raw Materials		

¹⁶ Due to the lack of available data or extensive periods of war, which would have had for effect to distort the results, we decided to discard and remove some countries such as Syria, Libya, Central African Republic, Burundi, Nigeria, etc., from the initial list of 52 countries of Cashin et al. (2004).

Table A.2: Main commodity exports and share of primary commodities in total exports

Country	Principal exports			Share in commodity exports (in %)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Argentina	Soy Meal	Wheat	Maize	18	13	11
Bolivia	Zinc	Tin	Gold	27	18	13
Brazil	Iron	Coffee	Aluminum	21	15	10
Canada	Softwood Sawn	Aluminum	Wheat	28	14	12
Chile	Copper	Fish	Fishmeal	70	9	6
Honduras	Coffee	Bananas	Shrimp	47	30	6
India	Rice	Shrimp	Soy Meal	18	15	12
Ivory Coast	Cocoa	Coffee	Cotton	65	14	6
Indonesia	Crude Petroleum	Natural Gas	Natural Rubber	34	23	7
Kenya	Tea	Coffee	Fish	53	30	5
Malawi	Tobacco	Tea	Sugar	78	8	7
Malaysia	Palm Oil	Natural Rubber	Hardwood Logs	44	15	15
Mali	Cotton	Gold		88	12	
Mauritania	Iron	Fish	Gold	65	34	1
Mexico	Crude Petroleum	Copper	Coffee	72	5	5
Morocco	Phosphate Rock	Fish	Lead	55	14	7
Mozambique	Cotton	Sugar	Maize	33	19	9
Niger	Uranium	Tobacco		96	3	
Norway	Crude Petroleum	Natural Gas	Fish	67	13	8
Papua New Guinea	Copper	Gold	Palm Oil	23	23	20
Paraguay	Soybeans	Cotton	Soy Meal	44	26	9
Philippines	Coconut Oil	Copper	Bananas	29	21	12
Peru	Copper	Fishmeal	Gold	28	19	15
Senegal	Phosphate Rock	Groundnut Oil	Fish	29	29	16
South Africa	Gold	Coal	Iron	46	20	5
Thailand	Rice	Natural Rubber	Shrimp	26	24	23
Togo	Phosphate Rock	Cotton	Coffee	44	40	9
Tunisia	Tobacco	Phosphate Rock	Shrimp	23	21	20
Turkey	Tobacco	Wheat	Sugar	34	16	14
Uganda	Coffee	Fish	Gold	71	8	4
Uruguay	Beef	Rice	Fish	36	27	13
Zambia	Copper	Sugar		97	2	

Notes: weights are calculated for the period 1991-2011. Source: Cashin et al. (2004), Table 1, pp. 246-247.

Table A.3: Descriptive statistics

	$\Delta REER$	ΔNFA	ΔToT^{com}	ΔBS	$M2/GDP$	FDI/GDP	$\Delta ComPI$
Metals Panel							
Mean	0.7%	1.1%	2.2%	0.8%	29.2%	35.6%	3.3%
Median	-0.05%	0.4%	-1.2%	1.0%	27.9%	28.3%	-3.8%
StDev	12.8%	53.1%	18.9%	4.7%	14.4%	28.2%	21.2%
Max	101.4%	386.7%	78.2%	12.7%	69.8%	140.1%	56.2%
Min	-48.7%	-422.2%	-46.6%	-20.6%	5.8%	1.6%	-23.0%
Food and Beverages Panel							
Mean	-0.006%	5.8%	1.1%	1.7%	39.3%	18.7%	0.2%
Median	0.5%	-0.02%	-0.1%	1.8%	30.7%	11.9%	-0.5%
StDev	12.5%	60.4%	18.6%	4.5%	28.7%	17.8%	11.6%
Max	88.9%	496.5%	96.8%	14.6%	141.8%	97.9%	24.1%
Min	-69.5%	-441.8%	-54.0%	-11.7%	6.9%	0.5%	-24.2%
Raw Materials Panel							
Mean	-0.07%	5.5%	2.7%	1.3%	38.2%	31.0%	1.9%
Median	-0.3%	2.6%	-0.1%	1.5%	32.0%	19.3%	1.1%
StDev	9.8%	30.0%	25.7%	5.0%	19.4%	32.1%	11.5%
Max	42.4%	309.3%	350.0%	20.8%	86.3%	195.6%	33.2%
Min	-69.4%	-75.7%	-62.3%	-20.3%	10.5%	0.02%	-17.2%
Energy Panel							
Mean	1.0%	5.6%	2.5%	0.6%	48.7%	29.3%	3.3%
Median	0.6%	2.3%	-0.006%	0.5%	45.4%	17.4%	-1.7%
StDev	13.9%	65.1%	22.3%	7.0%	18.3%	30.5%	24.1%
Max	142.7%	432.2%	66.5%	65.8%	86.3%	195.6%	55.8%
Min	-93.4%	-377.7%	-52.7%	-27.2%	16.1%	0.2%	-48.3%

Notes: StDev is the Standard Deviation. $\Delta REER$ is the variation of the real effective exchange rate, ΔNFA is the variation of the net foreign asset position (in percent of GDP), ΔToT^{com} is the variation of the commodity terms of trade, ΔBS is the variation of the Balassa-Samuelson effect and $\Delta ComPI$ is the volatility of the commodity price index.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the commodity price indices

	Food and Beverages	Metals	Raw Materials	Energy
Mean	0.24%	3.28%	1.88%	3.26%
Median	-0.52%	-3.80%	1.14%	-1.70%
StdDev	11.64%	21.24%	11.54%	24.14%
Max	24.14%	56.19%	33.19%	55.79%
Min	-24.22%	-23.00%	-17.15%	-48.33

Note: StDev is the Standard Deviation.

Table 2: Results of linearity tests against PSTR specification

	Whole Sample	Food and Beverages	Energy	Metals	Raw Materials
LM	7.696 (0.006)	5.118 (0.024)	4.177 (0.042)	4.220 (0.041)	4.981 (0.026)
F	13.244 (0.000)	3.403 (0.066)	5.669 (0.018)	3.255 (0.072)	4.741 (0.030)

Note: LM and F are, respectively, the Lagrange multiplier and tests for linearity. p-values are given in parentheses.

Table 3: Estimation of the PSTR model

Transition variable: M2/GDP										
	Whole Panel		Food and Beverages		Energy		Metals		Raw materials	
	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2
$\Delta ComPI$	-0.1592 ^{***}	0.0541 ^{***}	-0.6149 ^{***}	-0.0818 ^{***}	-0.2719 ^{**}	0.0387 ^{***}	0.0147	0.2701 ^{**}	-0.3902 ^{***}	-0.0205 ^{***}
ΔNFA		-0.0406		-0.0278 ^{***}		-0.0411 ^{***}		-0.0387 ^{**}		-0.1025 ^{***}
ΔToT^{com}		0.0229		0.0352		-0.0201		0.0480		0.0099
ΔBS		0.1117		0.5552 ^{***}		-0.0036		-0.0191		0.0427
\hat{c}		0.3244		0.1668		0.3206		0.3263		0.2686
$\hat{\gamma}$		2310.28		649.64		1629.35		1961.00		2797.66

Notes: Estimation of equation (1):

$$\Delta REER_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \beta_0 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} + \beta_1 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} * F(S_{i,t}; \gamma; c) + \varphi z_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

$\Delta ComPI$ stands for the volatility of the commodity price index, ΔNFA is the variation of net foreign assets, ΔToT^{com} is the variation of the commodity terms of trade, ΔBS is the variation of Balassa-Samuelson effect. \hat{c} represents the estimated threshold value, and $\hat{\gamma}$ is the estimated slope parameter of the transition function. Significant coefficient at 1% (***), 5% (**) or 10% (*).

Table 4: Estimation of the PSTR model

Transition variable: FDI/GDP										
	Whole Panel		Food and Beverages		Energy		Metals		Raw materials	
	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2
$\Delta ComPI$	-0.1901 ^{***}	0.0675 ^{***}	-0.2703	0.0289	-0.0863	0.0491 ^{**}	0.0061	0.2504 ^{***}	-0.4642 ^{***}	-0.0886 ^{***}
ΔNFA		-0.0387 ^{***}		-0.0102		-0.0053		-0.0373 ^{**}		-0.1008 ^{***}
ΔToT^{com}		0.0116		0.0401		-0.0260		0.0225		0.0077
ΔBS		0.1085 [*]		0.5702 ^{***}		0.0020		0.0138		0.0424
\hat{c}		0.1523		0.1737		0.1728		0.3136		0.0544
$\hat{\gamma}$		22.20		82035.23		6428.69		2992.29		1278.35

Notes: Estimation of equation (1):

$$\Delta REER_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \beta_0 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} + \beta_1 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} * F(S_{i,t}; \gamma, c) + \varphi z_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

$\Delta ComPI$ stands for the volatility of the commodity price index, ΔNFA is the variation of net foreign assets, ΔToT^{com} is the variation of the commodity terms of trade, ΔBS is the variation of Balassa-Samuelson effect. \hat{c} represents the estimated threshold value, and $\hat{\gamma}$ is the estimated slope parameter of the transition function. Significant coefficient at 1% (***), 5% (**) or 10% (*).

Table 5: Estimation of the PSTR model

Transition variable: private credit/GDP										
	Whole Panel		Food and Beverages		Energy		Metals		Raw materials	
	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2
$\Delta ComPI$	-0.2622 ^{***}	0.0203 ^{***}	-0.5800 ^{***}	-0.1637 ^{***}	-0.2008 ^{***}	0.0416 ^{***}	0.0244	0.2739 ^{***}	-0.4685 ^{***}	-0.1176 ^{**}
ΔNFA	-0.0379 ^{***}		-0.0208 ^{**}		-0.0352 ^{***}		-0.0294 ^{**}		-0.1048 ^{***}	
ΔToT^{com}	0.0309 ^{**}		0.0677 ^{**}		-0.0100		0.0387		0.0086	
ΔBS	0.1514 ^{**}		0.6253 ^{***}		-0.0027		0.0083		0.0207	
\hat{c}	0.0921		0.0883		0.0931		0.0793		0.1166	
$\hat{\gamma}$	3942.85		3592.38		1421.20		955.72		935.44	

Notes: Estimation of equation (1):

$$\Delta REER_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \beta_0 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} + \beta_1 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} * F(S_{i,t}; \gamma, c) + \varphi z_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

$\Delta ComPI$ stands for the volatility of the commodity price index, ΔNFA is the variation of net foreign assets, ΔToT^{com} is the variation of the commodity terms of trade, ΔBS is the variation of Balassa-Samuelson effect. \hat{c} represents the estimated threshold value, and $\hat{\gamma}$ is the estimated slope parameter of the transition function.

Significant coefficient at 1% (***), 5% (**) or 10% (*).

Table 6: Estimation of the PSTR model

Transition variable: commodity terms of trade										
	Whole Panel		Food and Beverages		Energy		Metals		Raw materials	
	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 1	Regime 2
$\Delta ComPI$	-0.1155 ^{***}	0.0497 ^{***}	-0.3297 ^{***}	-0.1347	-0.3427 ^{**}	-0.0615 ^{***}	0.0062	0.1679 [*]	-0.2129 ^{***}	-0.1616 ^{***}
ΔNFA	-0.0399 ^{***}		-0.0268 ^{**}		-0.0356 ^{***}		-0.0338 ^{**}		-0.1064 ^{***}	
ΔToT^{com}	0.0116		0.0422		-0.0122		0.0026		-0.0017	
ΔBS	0.0986		0.5895 ^{***}		-0.0290		-0.0286		0.0115	
\hat{c}	0.2485		0.0634		0.2813		0.2326		0.2153	
$\hat{\gamma}$	1023.95		451.52		5816.22		1466.00		42.68	

Notes: Estimation of equation (1):

$$\Delta REER_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \beta_0 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} + \beta_1 \Delta ComPI_{i,t} * F(S_{i,t}; \gamma, c) + \varphi z_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

$\Delta ComPI$ stands for the volatility of the commodity price index, ΔNFA is the variation of net foreign assets, ΔToT^{com} is the variation of the commodity terms of trade, ΔBS is the variation of Balassa-Samuelson effect. \hat{c} represents the estimated threshold value, and $\hat{\gamma}$ is the estimated slope parameter of the transition function.

Significant coefficient at 1% (***), 5% (**) or 10% (*).