

A Model of Exchange Rate Innovation That Accounts for Short and Long Term Determinants

Terry Boulter* and Steven Sullivan**

This paper develops a model of exchange rate determination within an error correction framework. Using daily data, the intention is to identify both short and long-term determinants that can be used to forecast the AUD/USD exchange rate. Specifically, the overnight interest rate differential, Australia's foreign trade-weighted exposure to commodity prices and exchange rate volatility all provide explanatory power for the AUD/USD exchange rate over the post float period 1984-2004. When forecast out of sample, the error correction model is found to perform better than a naïve random walk model based on three different metrics.

Field of Research: Exchange Rate Modelling, and, Forecasting

I. Introduction

It is curious that there is still no model of exchange rate determination that is best able to explain price innovation within foreign exchange markets. Failure to identify such a model has not been due to a lack of interest: in fact, the international finance literature is rich with empirical investigation of variables that attempt to explain exchange rate movements (see Moore and Roche 2006, Evans and Lyons, 2005 and MacDonald, 2000). None of the models developed so far are able to outperform the benchmark model where exchange rate innovation is replicated as a simple random walk (see Meese & Rogoff, 1983).

More recent models developed since the mid 1980's although improving are still less than ideal. Cheung *et al.* (2003) review a good selection of these but finds that they provide poor in sample fit, low out of sample forecasting accuracy (especially at short horizons) and general inconsistency across currencies and sample periods.

*Terry Boulter, Deakin Business School, Deakin University, Email: tboulter@deakin.edu.au

**Steven Sullivan, Dresdner Kleinwort, steven.sullivan@dkib.com

Boulter & Sullivan

There has been limited success forecasting exchange rates at longer horizons (12-18 months) using models grounded in purchasing power parity (PPP) and monetary theory (see MacDonald et al., 2002).

Moderate success at forecasting exchange rates in the long run yet the inability to do so in the short run has led to the idea that modelling should now try to combine both long and short run variables into a single integrated framework. Taylor (1995) cites this as the most important contemporary challenge facing exchange rate economists.

This paper takes up Taylor's (1995) challenge. This is done by incorporating into a single framework for the AUD/USD exchange rate both short and long term variables that are then used to forecast the short term. This is undertaken using data covering a twenty year period from December, 1984 to June, 2004.

The paper proceeds as follows. First, theoretical and empirical evidence pertaining to long run structural exchange rate models is reviewed. This is done in order to identify long term variables which have been empirically tested and that have been shown within the literature to have some success at forecasting the long term rate. This is undertaken in Section 2. Based on this evidence, stylized determinants of the AUD/USD exchange rate are identified. These long term variables are found to be interest rates, and commodity prices. In Section 3 testing is then undertaken to determine the equilibrium relationship that exists between the exchange rate and these determinants. An error correction term is then generated from these estimations which is used as a measure of speed of adjustment back to equilibrium. This term is then used within the short-term first differenced model that is used to forecast the exchange rate. The integrated framework and model is described in Section 4. The forecasting ability of the model is tested and compared to a benchmark random walk model. These results are discussed in Section 4.5.

The forecasting model that is developed is found to perform marginally better than the benchmark random walk model based on three comparison criteria. This provides some evidence that for the AUD/USD exchange rate over the sample period that when short and long run variables are integrated into a single framework a model of exchange rate determination can be developed that is marginally superior to a simple random walk modelling approach. Section 5 is a summary and provides some possible directions for future research. The finding within this study support Taylor's (1995) belief that an integrated approach where short and long term variables need to be identified to successfully forecast within the short term.

2. Review of Exchange Rate Modelling Literature

A. Monetary Models

Contemporary exchange rate theory underpinned by macro economics has, in the last four decades, produced several mainstream monetary models of exchange rate determination. These include the purchasing power parity

Boulter & Sullivan

(PPP) model, Frenkel's (1976) flexible price model, the sticky price model of Dornbusch (1976) and the real interest differential (RID) model developed by Frankel (1979). In order, these models are generally expressed as:

$$s_t = \alpha + \beta_1 p_t - \beta_2 p_t^* + u_t \quad (1)$$

$$s_t = \alpha(m_t - m_t^*) - \phi(y_t - y_t^*) + \lambda(\pi_t - \pi_t^*) \quad (2)$$

$$s_t = \alpha(m_t - m_t^*) - \phi(y_t - y_t^*) - \delta(r_t - r_t^*) \quad (3)$$

$$s_t = \alpha(m_t - m_t^*) - \phi(y_t - y_t^*) - \frac{1}{\theta}(r_t - r_t^*) + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} + \lambda\right)(\pi_t - \pi_t^*) \quad (4)$$

Within these expressions “*” denotes a foreign quantity, with a lowercase referring to a log transformation. (s) is a direct exchange rate quotation, (p) represents price level, (m) the money supply, (r) the interest rate, (π) the inflation rate and (y) the income level. Other classes of models, such as the Portfolio balance models (PBM) like those developed by Branson *et al.* (1977) and Dornbusch & Fischer (1980) generalize monetary models to a stock-flow setting, but difficulties involved with data acquisition relating to currency denominated holdings and the modelling of a risk premium have seen empirical testing of the PBM approach being less commonplace within the literature.

While early estimations of monetary models were most often supportive of their hypotheses (see Frenkel, 1976, Bilson, 1978, Frankel, 1979, Hooper & Morton, 1982), post 1978, testing led to a number of the original hypotheses being rejected (see Stockman 1980, Dornbusch & Fischer, 1980, Smith & Wickens 1986, Meese & Rogoff 1988). Irrespective, evidence has accumulated to confirm the increasing importance of monetary fundamentals the longer the horizon. Abuaf & Jorion (1990), Pedroni (2001), Rogoff (1996), Mark (1995) and Taylor (2002) corroborate the long run relationship between prices, money stocks, real income and exchange rates. While the general consensus is that exchange rates revert to some form of economic equilibrium in the long run, structural equation models fail to *consistently* explain exchange rates in both the long and short run, across currencies, time periods and forecast horizons (Meese & Rogoff (1983), Cheung *et al.* (2003)).

B. Australian Empirical Evidence

Structural model inconsistency has led researchers on an extensive search for relevant variables, with sporadic success usually at periods greater than one to three years. In this section, we review the evidence and theoretical foundations linking commodity prices and short term interest rates to AUD/USD exchange rate dynamics.

C. Commodity Prices: A Terms of Trade Proxy


World commodity markets are characterized by price takers, homogeneity and international price discovery. These three attributes allow commodity price movements to act as exogenous shocks to Terms of Trade (TOT) where no one country's actions dominate the world price of a given commodity.¹ In

Boulter & Sullivan

Australia, commodity prices have been shown to play a crucial role in determining the exchange rate, where they form a large, proportion of exports (see for example Blundell-Wignall *et al.* (1993), Chen (2003), Chen & Rogoff (2003), Gruen & Wilkinson (1994), Karfakis & Phipps (1999), and Webber (1997), Tarditi (1996)). Commodity exports in Australia account for approximately 20 percent of total domestic income. The Reserve Bank of Australia releases monthly a Commodity Price index which is comprised of seventeen of Australia's most important commodity exports. These seventeen commodities account for approximately 55% of Australia's total exports with wool, wheat, and various metals being examples of its leading exports. The weights in the index have changed periodically but the composition of the index has remained stable since its inception in 1994/95. Appendix 8 lists Australia's 17 most important export commodities and their importance within the index over time.

The terms-of-trade (TOT) is central to both the monetary approach, to the balance of payments approach and implicitly in the monetary models discussed above. Defined as the ratio of a country's export to import prices, the TOT theoretically shares a positive relationship with the exchange rate. A higher TOT results in greater trade income, thereby causing an exchange rate appreciation. Moreover, a rise in export income leads to a balance of payments surplus and increases foreign reserves, exerting upward pressure on the exchange rate. Figure 1 shows the importance of commodities in Australia's foreign trade, where they have historically accounted for well over half of total exports.

Figure 1: Australian Major Commodity Exports as a Percentage of Total Exports (Jan. 1988 – Sept. 2003)



Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Cat. No. 5432.0.65.001

Empirically, the relationship between the Australian dollar and terms-of-trade is well documented. Blundell-Wignall *et al.* (1993) estimate an error-correction model of the Australian-US dollar real exchange rate (and real trade weighted index) from 1973 to 1992.ⁱⁱ Using real long-term interest

Boulter & Sullivan

differentials and TOT in the equilibrium equation over two sub-sample periods, the TOT has significant coefficient values of 0.619 (1973-1992) and 0.8 (1984-1992). The post-float effect seems stronger and is consistent with greater economic integration during this period. Gruen & Wilkinson (1994) model the real exchange rate and TOT in Engle-Granger and Phillips-Hanson estimations using quarterly data from 1969 to 1990. They find a one percent increase in the TOT is associated with an appreciation of the real exchange rate between 0.91 and 1.08 percent. Their results also show a stronger relationship over the post-float period. Tarditi (1996) uses an unrestricted error-correction model and finds that contemporaneous and lagged TOT terms are associated with positive real exchange rate returns. The estimated coefficient is 1.41 for a contemporaneous shock and 0.46 for a lagged shock. Karfakis & Phipps (1999) reach similar conclusions for nominal exchange rates in an error-correction model. Using monthly data from 1984-1995, they find the TOT exhibits a strong cointegrating relationship with a positive coefficient value of 0.93. Chen (2003) explores whether commodity prices can explain nominal exchange rates in the small open economies of Australia, Canada and New Zealand where primary commodities in all three countries form a substantial portion of exports. Chen augments four models, including the asset-approach, flexible price and sticky price monetary models as well as the relative PPP model with country specific commodity price indices. For Australia, Chen reports cointegration between commodity prices and the exchange rate in three of the four models, with commodity price coefficients ranging from 0.56 to 0.92. Furthermore, the inclusion of a commodity price index not only substantially improves in-sample fit and out of sample forecasting accuracy, but also leads to more sensible coefficient signs. Chen & Rogoff (2003) extend these results to real exchange rates with the same conclusions for Australia and New Zealand.ⁱⁱⁱ

The empirical evidence supporting the relationship between Australia's terms-of-trade and the exchange rate has become more or less a stylised fact. With an expectation that commodity prices, as a terms-of-trade proxy, exact a significant and positive influence on Australia's exchange rate over the post-float period. We therefore include this within our modelling framework..


D. Interest rates

Interest rates play a pivotal role in the economics and determination of exchange rates. Equations (3) and (4) illustrate their expected appreciative effects within a monetary model framework. There is however, ambiguity about how interest rates interact with exchange rates within a floating regime. A relative rise in rates can presumably reflect expected inflation and thus have in a depreciative influence on the exchange rate. Alternatively, an asset market point of view would predict an appreciation via increased capital inflows. Similarly, there are issues over which interest rate is the best to use within a forecasting model. Arguments involve themes including but not limited to oversimplicity, the inability to capture complementary and substitution effects between long and short rates, information distortion from central bank intervention, time varying risk premia and frequency etc.

Boulter & Sullivan

Figure 2 highlights the historical relationship between the daily nominal AUD/USD exchange rate and the 10-year interest rate differential from 1984 to 2004. The relationship is mild with some degree of correlation (-0.43).^{iv} A brief empirical review of the relation between interest rates and exchange rates in a traditional model setting has been summarized previously in section A above. Australian evidence is limited and usually researched in conjunction with the terms-of-trade models. Gruen & Wilkinson (1994) estimate a long run model in levels of the real exchange rate. Unlike pre-float results, post-float data show the long-term real interest differential (vis-à-vis the world rate) exhibits a positive and strong cointegrating relationship with the exchange rate. An appreciation of 2 to 3.5 percent is associated with a one-percentage increase in the long-term real interest differential. They note that this relationship is stronger than the short-term real interest rate differential, but weaker than expected by theory. Blundell-Wignall *et al.* (1993) estimate a similar model and find a cointegrating relationship, but the long-term interest rate differential coefficient signs are mixed. Post-float tests also indicate it has a positive coefficient sign and is significant indicating it shares an equilibrium relationship with the real exchange rate. Tarditi (1996) is one of a few who uses the yield gap, or the relative difference between the slopes of domestic and foreign yield curves in an unrestricted error-correction model.

Figure 2: AUD/USD and Long (10 year) Interest Rate Differential



Source: Reuters Datastream

The yield gap is used to capture forward-looking expectations as well as the stance on monetary policy. Using quarterly data, Tarditi (1996) finds the yield gap to be statistically significant at one percent in the post-float period when regressed on the real exchange rate. Djoudad *et al.* (2000) build an error-correction model with the real exchange rate, real energy and real non-energy commodity price indices as well as the real Australian-US short-term interest differential. Unlike Gruen & Wilkinson (1994), the short-term real interest differential is positive and significant.

With theoretical ambiguity and mixed evidence surrounding the role that interest rates play in determining the AUD/USD exchange rate, we proceed by testing both short and long and term nominal interest rates. Our expectations

Boulter & Sullivan

align with the asset market perspective where it is thought that capital flows directly influence the exchange rate and positive interest rate differentials induce appreciation.

E. Volatility

Finance theory makes the point that increased risk requires higher returns. Viewing foreign currency as a tradable asset, *ceteris paribus*, the same premise would require greater returns as compensation for exposure to increasing exchange rate volatility. Based on evidence presented that volatility influences exchange rate innovation (see Eichengreen, 1988, Dornbusch, 1987, and Goldstein, 1995), we expand our core list of stylized determinants by including a volatility proxy in the modeling framework.

F. Summary

Empirical evidence concerning Australia typically reveals that both the long-term interest rate differential and the terms of trade (or commodity prices) share a positive relationship with the exchange rate. Volatility has had a lower level of inquiry than either of these macro variables, but is investigated here because of its relevance in terms of the risk return trade-off.

Section 3 which follows provides a description of the data and methodology.

3. Data and Empirical Analysis

We now proceed to describe the variables in the model as well as tests determining their degree of integration and subsequent cointegration with the exchange rate: a prerequisite for being included within the model. A short-term error correction model is then estimated to examine the relationship between the nominal exchange rate, cointegrated (long-term) and short-term determinants. Finally, the model is evaluated and its forecasting ability compared against a simple random walk.

G. Data

Like Chen (2003), this investigation explains nominal exchange rate innovation with interest rates and commodity prices. At this point, we depart from the standard approach which has traditionally focused on monthly or quarterly data and seek to extend on previous work by trying to explain higher frequency movements. In addition we look at what effects, if any, the role that exchange rate volatility plays.^v The sample represents twenty years of daily observations during the floating period, from December, 1984 to June, 2004.

Since neither theory nor empiricism is firm on which interest rate to use, we take the lead from evidence connecting short term interest rates and exchange rate movements and then also include long term interests rates and the yield gap differentials. Four common interest rate variables are applied, each representing a different term. They are the overnight, 90 day and 10 year interest rate differentials as well as the yield gap. The last variable, the yield gap, is the difference between the slopes of the Australian and US yield

Boulter & Sullivan

curves. Essentially, it is a restricted form of the cash and 10 year interest rate differentials. To see this, consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} [(i_c - i_{10Y}) - (i_c - i_{10Y})^*] &= i_c - i_{10Y} - i_c^* + i_{10Y}^* \\ &= (i_c - i_c^*) - (i_{10Y} - i_{10Y}^*) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the coefficient on the foreign yield curve slope is restricted to negative one, whilst the magnitude on both domestic and foreign yield curves is restricted to equality (symmetry).^{vi}

To proxy Australia's exposure to commodity prices and more generally terms of trade shocks, a daily trade-weighted commodity price futures index is used.^{vii} Whilst providing daily observations, we use a futures index in an attempt to capture forward looking expectations that correlates closely with and explains higher frequency movements in the AUD/USD exchange rate.^{viii,ix}

A volatility variable is also constructed by creating an index of currencies based on how actively they are traded vis-à-vis the Australian dollar. Specifically, the variances in returns of six currencies are multiplied by the weight of each currency, where the weights represent each currency's level of turnover in relation to the Australian dollar. The volatility variable is described as follows:

$$VOL = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \Delta s_{i,mid}^2 \quad (5)$$

Weights are taken from the BIS 2001 triennial central bank survey and defined as the percentage of foreign exchange turnover with the Australian dollar. Theory suggests increased volatility should lead to increased required rates of return and hence lower prices. Thus, a positive coefficient is expected.

Appendix 2 provides both line-graph plots of all variables as well as their descriptive statistics. Apart from VOL and YGAP, all series appear to exhibit characteristics consistent with a random walk with the possibility of deterministic components. All interest rate differentials have a positive mean, indicating that on average Australian interest rates were above their US counterparts over the sample period. The mean yield gap difference is approximately zero, implying the slopes of each country's yield curve were on average equal. Table 1 demonstrates that all interest rate differentials are highly correlated with each other, and are negatively correlated with the exchange rate. As expected, the long-term interest rate differential has the strongest correlation with the exchange rate.

Boulter & Sullivan

Table 1: Variable Correlations

	S	s	RIC	RIL	RIS	COMPI	compi	YGAP
S	1	0.997	-0.304	-0.435	-0.309	-0.686	-0.718	-0.123
s		1	-0.305	-0.435	-0.311	-0.710	-0.740	-0.124
RIC			1	0.887	0.974	0.322	0.316	0.904
RIL				1	0.908	0.441	0.443	0.605
RIS					1	0.353	0.343	0.841
COMPI						1	0.994	0.149
compi							1	0.135
YGAP								1

Also as hypothesized, the commodity price index shares a strong relationship with the exchange rate. Its negative sign implies that on average a rise in the commodity price index is associated with an AUD/USD appreciation. (Remember that the exchange rate is quoted direct.)

H. Integration and Cointegration

Before our variables are included within the model, the degree of integration needs to be determined. This is done using Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) and Phillips Perron (PP) tests for unit roots and the KPSS (Kwiatkowski et al. (1992)) test for stationarity. The KPSS test is included to confirm the ADF and PP tests which have low power if the process is stationary but with a root close to the non-stationary boundary. The null of a unit root process is given against three alternative hypotheses that include no constant, a constant, and a trend and constant in the test equation. The levels tests are estimated as:

$$\Delta y_t = \phi y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \Delta y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (6)$$

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha + \phi y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \Delta y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha + \lambda t + \phi y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \Delta y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (8)$$

Including all three alternatives removes the subjectivity involved in determining the nature of a given time series. Akaike and Schwarz information criterion (AIC and SIC respectively) are used to determine which specification is most appropriate for each variable. This avoids lost power from misspecification and helps identify which values give the most important interpretation. First differenced ADF test statistics are included to confirm each variables order of integration.

Cointegration tests are carried out on all non-stationary variables using both Engle & Granger (1987) (EG) and Johansen & Juselius (1990) vector cointegration methods. The EG cointegrating regression, which regresses the exchange rate on non-stationary variables, is (generically) specified as:

$$y_t = X\beta + Y_1\eta_1 + e_t \quad (9)$$

Boulter & Sullivan

ADF critical values follow non-normal distributions that are derived in MacKinnon (1996).^x The Johansen (1988) and Johansen & Juselius (1990) methods are based on vector auto regressions (VAR's) and take a multivariate approach to overcome some of the deficiencies related to the EG two-step procedure. Two test statistics are used to determine the number of cointegrating relationships:

$$\lambda_{trace}(r) = -T \sum_{i=r+1}^g \ln(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i) \quad (10)$$

$$\lambda_{max}(r, r+1) = -T \ln(1 - \hat{\lambda}_{r+1}) \quad (11)$$

The value r represents the number of cointegrating vectors under the null hypothesis and λ the number of eigenvalues from the Π matrix. Significant λ 's represent cointegrating vectors. The λ -trace test statistic is a joint test where the null hypothesis is that there exist r -cointegrating vectors against the alternative of greater than r vectors. The λ -max test is separate to each eigenvalue and has the null of r cointegrating vectors against the alternative of $r + 1$.

I. Forecast & Evaluation

The final step is to use the model to make a future forecast and to compare its forecasting ability against that of a simple random walk model.^{xi} The holdout sample used is from observation 4500 to 5077, leaving 577 days or approximately two years of forecasted values. Forecast evaluation is undertaken using four performance and three variance decomposition statistics. The four performance statistics are the root mean square error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) and Theil's Inequality coefficient. The first two of these are relative measures that can be compared across models, whilst a lower value for all four measures indicates better performance than the random walk benchmark. The latter two are scale invariant. The last three statistics are decompositions of the mean squared forecast error; the bias, variance and covariance proportions. All proportions sum to one, with a superior model having most of the bias concentrated in the covariance proportion.

4. Results

J. Integration of Variables

This section examines to what order each variable is integrated. A summary of test results is shown in Table 2 with testing details given in Appendix 3. The ADF tests (in levels) show the null of non-stationarity cannot be rejected for s , S , RiC , RiS , RiL , $compi$ and $COMPI$ indicating they all contain a unit root. As expected, VOL is stationary and will therefore only be considered in the short run equation. $YGAP$ yields mixed results with the non-stationary null rejected at 5 and 10 percent significance levels for alternative hypothesis assumptions of a constant and no constant respectively. On this basis alone, the yield gap is concluded to be stationary. Appendix 3 also shows rejection

Boulter & Sullivan

of all test statistics for the null hypothesis of $I(2)$, implying that there are no variables that are greater than $I(1)$.^{xii} Whilst mainly confirming the ADF test results, the PP test statistics as shown in **Error! Reference source not found.** does highlight the fact that differences exists between the findings for the two tests. YGAP is stationary with rejections at one percent for all model assumptions, but RiC is also rejected at the same significance level for all assumptions, implying that this variable is also stationary. Furthermore, RiL is rejected under a trend and constant assumption at five percent. Finally, the KPSS tests also reveal results which support the ADF tests, but with minor differences. Interestingly, the test rejects the stationarity null of all variables, including RiC and YGAP at one percent for all estimations and VOL at five percent with a constant.

Table 2: Summary of Unit Root Tests

NS = Non-stationary. S = stationary. Please refer to Appendix 3 and **Error! Reference source not found.** for detailed test statistics and p-values.

	ADF - Levels			PP - Levels			KPSS - Levels	
	μ	$\mu \& \pi$	-	μ	$\mu \& \pi$	-	μ	$\mu \& \pi$
S	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
s	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
RiC	NS	NS	NS	S	S	S	NS	NS
RiS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
RiL	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS
YGAP	S	NS	S	S	S	S	NS	NS
COMPI	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
compi	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
VOL	S	S	S	S	S	S	NS	S

The tests highlight differences for RiC and YGAP. The PP test statistics indicate stationarity where the other two tests indicate non-stationarity. Intuition would lead one to believe that at least the YGAP is stationary due to the nature of its construction.^{xiii} This aside, objectively drawn conclusions based on minimizing type II error are made when contradictions exist in terms of test results. This is achieved by accepting either ADF or PP results when they are supported by one other test procedure. On this basis, YGAP is considered stationary and RiC non-stationary. To conclude, all variables are found to be non-stationary and integrated of order one except VOL, RiC and YGAP.

K. Cointegration Results

For the EG tests, 14 cointegrating regressions are estimated for log-nominal exchange rates and commodity price series. As demonstrated in Appendix 4, only the commodity price index and the spot rate produce a cointegrating vector. These results are not particularly encouraging. However the shortcomings of the EG procedure including low power to reject the null when

Boulter & Sullivan

the process is near unit root can be improved upon by using the more powerful Johansen tests.

Each Johansen test assumes four different model assumptions, including constants and trends, both in and outside of the cointegration equation. In Appendix 5, a summary of the number of cointegrating vectors found for each set of variables is given. The results are based on both test statistics (values not reported) at five percent significance level. The evidence overwhelmingly indicates that there is a cointegrating relationship between the overnight interest rate differential and the exchange rate. There is one cointegrating vector between the exchange rate yield gap and commodity price index. Both λ -trace and λ -max statistics are rejected for commodity prices and the overnight interest rate when intercept and trend assumptions are made. It is interesting to note that the long-term interest differential shares no such relationship with the exchange rate in isolation, even though it is an element of the yield gap, which does. The strongest cointegrating relationships entails combinations involving the yield gap and overnight interest rates.

Another important fact to be taken into consideration is that interest rates are usually cointegrated across countries and term structures. Therefore, any multiple variable tests involving more than one interest rate series is likely to contain a cointegrating vector between interest rates and not with the exchange rate. Furthermore, such combinations would be undesirable in any equilibrium model because they would induce very high multi-collinearity. Excluding the yield gap, one should only consider the overnight interest rate and commodity prices in forming a cointegrating relationship. The short-term interest rate differential seems to play only a minor role in equilibrium if any, since the S, RiS, and YGAP combination yields multiple rejections. It appears the most plausible relationship that could be viably estimated in a long run model of the AUD/US exchange rate would include the overnight interest rate differential and commodity price index. The next section incorporates these findings into an error-correction model of the exchange rate.

L. Error-correction Model

An error-correction representation between two variables X and Y can be stated as:

$$\Delta Y_t = \alpha + \gamma_1 \hat{u}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_{1i} \Delta Y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_{2i} \Delta X_{t-i} + u_{1t} \quad (12)$$

$$\Delta X_t = \alpha + \gamma_2 \hat{u}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_{3i} \Delta Y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_{4i} \Delta X_{t-i} + u_{2t} \quad (13)$$

Assuming directional causality from X to Y, equation (12) is the basic error-correction model and the one employed within this study.

Based on the results presented, the most plausible specification for a long run equation is to include the overnight interest rate and the commodity price index. Multicollinearity would imply that attempting to estimate multiple interest rates in a cointegrating equation would lead to unstable coefficient magnitudes and signs. Taking combinations of these variables such as the yield gap is not a viable solution since they induce stationarity (as exhibited by

Boulter & Sullivan

the yield gap). This immediately precludes including them within the cointegrating equation, but does not mean they should be excluded from the short run equation. With this in mind, the following estimation is undertaken:

$$s_t = 2.80 - 0.313RiC - 0.514compi \quad (14)$$

(0.033) (0.039) (0.007)

$$R^2 = 0.511$$

All coefficients are significant at one percent and the regressions explain approximately half of the variation in the exchange rate. The complete regression output generated in Eviews is presented in Appendix 6. Respecifying this equation as error-correction terms results in:

$$\hat{u}_{2t} = (s_t - 2.80 - 0.313RiC - 0.514compi) \quad (15)$$

Equations (14) and (15) are the final error correction terms that are used within the short run equation. The commodity price coefficient of -0.514 is consistent with the empirical evidence presented above. Moreover, commodity price coefficients between 0.5 and 1 have been shown by Chen & Rogoff (2003) to be theoretically reconcilable with Balassa-Samuelson flexible and sticky price type models.^{xiv} The interest rate coefficients appear to have a weaker relationship with the exchange rate than previous findings suggest. A one percent rise in interest rates causes a simultaneous appreciation of the exchange rate of approximately 0.3 percent. A result anticipated by the low correlation as shown in Table 1.

The error-correction model is estimated in the form of equation (12) with specification based on minimising Schwarz's information criteria. Table 3 shows the estimates with the full output available in **Error! Reference source not found..**

Table 3: Error-correction Model

Log		
Variable	Coefficient	P-Value
ECT _{log, t-1}	-0.0039	0.000
VOL	11.405	0.000
VOL _{t-1}	1.321	0.038
VOL _{t-2}	-5.548	0.000
RIS _{t-1}	-0.163	0.030
RIS _{t-2}	0.1568	0.037
Δcompi _{t-1}	-0.040	0.001

All variables are significant to at least five percent. The cointegrating equation implies disturbances take approximately 240 days to adjust back to equilibrium. This equates to roughly one working year. Economically, this adjustment is reasonable and coincides with the real interest differential and

Boulter & Sullivan

terms-of-trade equilibrium defined in Blundell-Wignall *et al.* (1993) where approximately two thirds of the equilibrium equation error is corrected within five to six quarters.

The variable estimates obtained from the model reveal the short run dynamic adjustment that takes place. The negative commodity price coefficient is consistent with the idea that higher commodity prices appreciate the exchange rate, even in the short run on a daily basis. For a one percent rise in commodity prices, the exchange rate appreciates approximately 0.4 percent.

The volatility variable indicates increased risk contemporaneously depreciates the exchange rate. The short-term interest rate also reveals a different relationship. After an appreciating effect in the first period, the exchange rate depreciates by an almost equal magnitude in the next. It therefore seems that the AUD/USD's short-term dynamics are influenced by both the 'transactional' risk associated with highly traded counterparty currencies as well as the 90-day interest rate differential. Moreover, interest rates affect the exchange rate in both the long and short run. This finding might be interpreted as cash rates reflecting the stance of monetary policy, whilst the 90 day rates indicate the markets short-term expectations.

M. Diagnostics of the Model

Model diagnostics hold up relatively well. Values of the Durbin Watson test statistics are close to two, indicating there is no serial correlation within the models error term. Tests of the distribution for the error term also find it to be leptokurtic and slightly negatively skewed. Non-normal residuals however are not necessarily a problem.^{xv} Homoskedastic error terms are also necessary for valid OLS estimation. Using the test proposed by White (1980), the errors are in fact shown to be heteroskedastic. To combat this, all equations are estimated with White's heteroskedasticity consistent standard error estimates. Next, the correct functional form of the equation was tested using Ramsey (1969) auxiliary equations with higher order fitted terms. The null of correct form was rejected at one percent, indicating non-linear dynamics may be present. Finally, a likelihood ratio based test for omitted variables indicates no bias to be present.^{xvi} Therefore, whilst some OLS assumptions have been violated, they either impose trivial consequences or are easily corrected.^{xvii}

N. Comparison of Model to Random Walk

Finally the model is used to forecast out of sample. Within this section the model is compared against a random walk model. Table 4 provides a comparison of the two models.

Boulter & Sullivan

Table 4: Out of Sample Forecast Comparison with a Random Walk

Random Walk is estimated as $\Delta s_t = \phi \Delta s_{t-1} + u_t$

	$\Delta s_{\text{random walk}}$	log ECM
RMSE	0.2223	0.1117
MAE	0.1843	0.0820
MAPE	52.1475	24.5895
Theil Inequality Coefficient	0.1972	0.1108
Bias Proportion	0.6874	0.3150
Variance Proportion	0.3126	0.4104
Covariance Proportion	0.0000	0.2746

The RMSE and MAE indicate that the model performs better than a simple random walk model. The Theil statistic also confirms the dominance over a random walk with values close to zero. The variance decomposition statistics show that not all the bias is derived from the covariance, but the proportion it does account for is not trivial. Overall, there is strong evidence to show that the model can forecast the AUD/USD exchange rate significantly better than an estimated or naïve random walk model.

5. Summary and Conclusion

Establishing whether exchange rates and economic variables share equilibrium relationships has been the focus of many contemporary empirical investigations in financial economics. Understanding what underlies exchange rate movements is important for improving both business planning and economic policy. Whilst exchange rates are extremely difficult to predict in the short run, they share equilibrium or cointegrating relationships with economic variables that can be combined with short run dynamics to forecast the exchange rate marginally better than a simple random walk.

The AUD/USD exchange rate moves in equilibrium with the overnight interest rate differential and a trade-weighted commodity price index. Theories of exchange rate determination such as the monetary model or portfolio balance model explain these relationships through financial arbitrage or monetary equilibrium. Whilst 90-day and 10-year interest rate differentials were not cointegrated with the exchange rate, Engle-Granger and Johansen tests show a weak cointegrating relationship between the exchange rate, commodity prices and the overnight interest rate differential. Subsequently, an error-correction model was constructed including an equilibrium correction term, short-term interest rate differential, commodity prices and a foreign exchange transaction weighted volatility proxy. Commodity prices and interest rate differentials tend to appreciate the exchange rate whilst volatility depreciates it. The fact that commodity prices influence the exchange rate may have significant policy implications for Australia as well as other developing countries with commodity based economies. Finally, the full model specification was forecasted out of sample and shown to dominate an

Boulter & Sullivan

estimated and naïve random walk based on three different metrics. This result goes some way to bridging the Meese & Rogoff (1983) forecasting puzzle and is useful because predicting the exchange rates movements better allows policy makers and practitioners to manage their risk exposures.

To conclude, this study has contributed to the literature in three distinct ways. It has shown that the AUD/USD exchange moves in equilibrium with the Australian-US overnight interest rate differential and Australia's foreign trade-weighted exposure to commodity prices. Increases in both of these induce an appreciating effect on the Australian dollar. Volatility, commodity prices and the Australian-US short-term interest rate differential further influence its short run dynamics. Unlike interest rates or commodity prices, volatility has an immediate depreciating effect on the Australian dollar.

Exchange rate modeling is a notoriously difficult exercise. Identifying variables that affect one exchange rate does not necessarily imply they will generalize to other exchange rates. The analysis of commodity prices in particular will be less significant for manufacturing or service oriented economies, than developing or commodity-based economies. To this end, the evidence presented can only be considered relevant to the AUD/USD exchange rate, although worthwhile insights may result from extending this approach to other small, open economies with free floating exchange rate mechanisms.

Endnote

¹ Both Webber (1997) and Chen & Rogoff (2003) discuss and present evidence on this matter.

² Blundell-Wignall *et al.* (1993) give an especially good historical overview of the relationship between the terms-of-trade and Australian dollar.

³ Chen and Rogoff (2003) give an excellent review of problems associated with using commodity prices in exchange rate models.

⁴ A direct quotation means a fall in this value represents an appreciation.

⁵ Data sources for the following variable definitions are available in Appendix 1.

⁶ This estimation is consistent with Tarditi (1996).

⁷ Chen and Rogoff (2003) show that commodity prices are an exogenous and important determinant for terms of trade shocks to the Australian dollar.

⁸ Westpac Research indicates this index, among others available, has the highest correlation with the AUD/USD exchange rate.

⁹ Commodity prices appear to capture more of the higher frequency swings in the exchange rate. Chen (2003)

Boulter & Sullivan

- ¹⁰ This is a freely available computer program obtainable from <http://www.econ.queensu.edu/faculty/mackinnon>.
- ¹¹ The random walk model is estimated from the AUD/USD series as $y = \beta y_{t-1}$.
- ¹² YGAP is the differential of two differentials. Tarditi (1996) also confirms a quarterly yield gap to be stationary.
- ¹³ The Balassa-Samuelson model is an extension of PPP that incorporates the productivity differential between traded and non-traded goods sectors.
- ¹⁴ Given a sample size of 5077, the central limit theorem means that such a violation is virtually inconsequential, with test statistics being asymptotically distributed even in the face of non-normality.
- ¹⁵ Omitted variables included only those specified. All tests were conducted in Eviews.
- ¹⁶ Appendix 9 discusses the issue of symmetry in modelling interest rates.
- ¹⁷ This is strictly consistent with log estimations only.
- ¹⁸ This fact seemed to improve for longer interest rates, with the 10 year unrestricted rates having the correct signs but different magnitudes.
- ¹⁹ This implies bonds to be homogenous assets similar to gold. Risk varies across countries, yet to the extent that one country's bonds are substitutable to that of another country's of similar risk, the analysis' conclusions can be paralleled.
- ²⁰ Manzur (2003) pp 146-158. Manzur analyses a differential shock in terms of apportionment between domestic and foreign commodity prices.

References

- Abuaf, N., & Jorion, P. 1990. Purchasing Power Parity in the Long Run. *Journal of Finance*, 45(1).
- Adler, M., & Lehmann, B. 1983. Deviations from Purchasing Power Parity in the Long Run. *Journal of Finance*, 38(5).
- Aggarwal, R., & Schirm, D. 1992. Balance of Trade Announcements and Asset Prices: Influence on Equity Prices, Exchange Rates, and Interest Rates. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 11(1), 80-95.
- Allen, H., & Taylor, M. P. 1990. Charts, Noise and Fundamentals in the London Foreign Exchange Market. *Economic Journal*, 100(400), 49-59.
- Allen, H., & Taylor, M. P. 1992. The Use of Technical Analysis in the Foreign Exchange Market. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 11(3), 304-314.

Boulter & Sullivan

- Balduzzi, P., Bertola, G., & Foresi, S. 1995. Asset Price Dynamics and Infrequent Feedback Trades. *Journal of Finance*, 50(5), 1747-1766.
- Berben, R. B., & van Dijk, D. J. 1998. *Does the absence of cointegration explain the typical findings in long horizon regressions?* Rotterdam: Erasmus University. Report.
- Bergin, P. R., & Feenstra, R. C. 2001. Pricing-to-Market, Staggered Contracts, and Real Exchange Rate Persistence. *Journal of International Economics*, 54(2), 333-359.
- Berkowitz, J., & Giorgianni, L. 2001. Long-Horizon Exchange Rate Predictability? *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83(1), 81-91.
- Bilson, J. F. O. 1978. The Current Experience with Floating Exchange Rates: An Appraisal of the Monetary Approach. *American Economic Review*, 68(2), 392-397.
- BIS. 2002. *Triennial Central Bank Survey: Foreign Exchange and Derivatives Market Activity in 2001*: Bank for International Settlements.
- Blundell-Wignall, A., Fahrner, J., & Heath, A. 1993. *Major Influences on the Australian Dollar Exchange Rate*: Reserve Bank of Australia. The Exchange Rate, International Trade and the Balance of Payments.
- Boothe, P., & Glassman, D. 1987. Off the Mark: Lessons for Exchange Rate Modelling. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 39(3), 443-457.
- Branson, W. H., Halttunen, H., & Masson, P. 1977. Exchange Rates in the Short Run: The Dollar-Deutschemerk Rate. *European Economic Review*, 10(3), 303-324.
- Brooks, C. 2002. *Introductory Econometrics for Finance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campa, J. M., & Wolf, H. C. 1997. *Is Real Exchange Rate Mean Reversion Caused by Arbitrage?*: National Bureau of Economic Research. Working Paper No. 6162.
- Caporale, G. M., Pittis, N., & Sakellis, P. 2003. Testing for PPP: The Erratic Behaviour of Unit Root Tests. *Economics Letters*, 80(2), 277-284.
- Cassel, G. 1918. Abnormal Deviations in International Exchanges. *Economic Journal*, 28, 413-415.
- Cassel, G. 1928. *Foreign Investments*: University of Chicago Press.
- Chen, J., & Mark, N. C. 1996. Alternative Long-Horizon Exchange-Rate Predictors. *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 1(4), 229-250.
- Chen, Y.-C. 2003. *Exchange Rates and Fundamentals: Evidence from Commodity Economies* (Mimeograph): Harvard University.
- Chen, Y.-C., & Rogoff, K. 2003. Commodity Currencies. *Journal of International Economics*, 60(1), 133-160.
- Cheung, Y.-W., Chinn, M., & Fujii, E. 2001. Market Structure and the Persistence of Sectoral Real Exchange Rates. *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 6(2), 95-114.
- Cheung, Y.-W., Chinn, M., & Pascual, A. G. 2003. *Empirical Exchange Rate Models of the Nineties: Are Any Fit to Survive?*: University of California, Santa Cruz. Working Paper No. 03-14.

Boulter & Sullivan

- Cheung, Y.-W., & Chinn, M. D. 2000. Currency Traders and Exchange Rate Dynamics: A Survey of the US Market. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 20(4), 439-471.
- Cheung, Y.-W., Chinn, M. D., & Marsh, I. W. 2000. *How Do UK-Based Foreign Exchange Dealers Think Their Market Operates?*: National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper: 7524.
- Cheung, Y.-W., & Lai, K. S. 2000. On Cross-Country Differences in the Persistence of Real Exchange Rates. *Journal of International Economics*, 50(2), 375-397.
- Cheung, Y.-W., & Wong, C. Y.-P. 2000. A Survey of Market Practitioners' Views on Exchange Rate Dynamics. *Journal of International Economics*, 51(2), 401-419.
- Chinn, M. D., & Meese, R. A. 1995. Banking on Currency Forecasts: How Predictable Is Change in Money? *Journal of International Economics*, 38(1-2), 161-178.
- De Grauwe, P. 1996. *International Money: Postwar Trends and Theories* (Second ed.). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Long, J. B. 1990. Positive Feedback Investment Strategies and Destabilizing Rational Speculation. *Journal of Finance*, 45(2), 379-395.
- Deravi, K., Gregorowicz, P., & Hegji, C. E. 1988. Balance of Trade Announcements and Movements in Exchange Rates. *Southern Economic Journal*, 55(2), 279-287.
- Dickey, D. A., & Fuller, W. 1979. Distribution of the Estimators for Autoregressive Time Series with a Unit Root. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(366), 427-431.
- Djoudad, R., Murray, J., Chan, T., & Daw, J. 2000. *The Role of Chartists and Fundamentalists in Currency Markets: The Experience of Australia, Canada and New Zealand*: Bank of Canada. Working Paper.
- Dornbusch, R. 1976. Expectations and Exchange Rate Dynamics. *Journal of Political Economy*, 84(6), 1161.
- Dornbusch, R., & Fischer, S. 1980. Exchange Rates and the Current Account. *American Economic Review*, 70(5), 960-971.
- Edison, H. J. 1997. The Reaction of Exchange Rates and Interest Rates to News Releases. *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 2(2), 87-100.
- Enders, W. 1989. Unit Roots and the Real Exchange Rate before World War I: The Case of Britain and the USA. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 8(1), 59-73.
- Engel, C., & Hamilton, J. D. 1990. Long Swings in the Dollar: Are They in the Data and Do Markets Know It? *American Economic Review*, 80(4), 689-713.
- Engle, R. F., & Granger, C. W. J. 1987. Co-integration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing. *Econometrica*, 55(2), 251-277.
- Eun, C. S., & Sabherwal, S. 2002. Forecasting Exchange Rates: Do Banks Know Better? *Global Finance Journal*, 13(2), 195-215.
- Evans, M. & Lyons, R. 2005. Meese-Rogoff Redux: Micro-Based Exchange Rate Forecasting. *American Economic Review*, 95(2), 405-414.
- Eviews. 2002. *Eviews Users Guide 4.1*. Unpublished manuscript.

Boulter & Sullivan

- Fang, Y., & Xu, D. 2003. The predictability of asset returns: an approach combining technical analysis and time series forecasts. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 19, 369-385.
- Farmer, D. J., & Joshi, S. 2002. The Price Dynamics of Common Trading Strategies. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 49, 149-171.
- Farrell, M. J. 1966. Profitable Speculation. *Economica*, 33(2), 183-194.
- Frankel, J. A. 1979. On the Mark: A Theory of Floating Exchange Rates Based on Real Interest Differentials. *American Economic Review*, 69(4), 610-622.
- Frankel, J. A. 1983. Estimation of Portfolio-Balanced Functions That Are Mean-Variance Optimizing: The Mark and the Dollar. *European Economic Review*, 23(3), 315-327.
- Frankel, J. A., & Froot, K. A. 1990. Chartists, Fundamentalists, and Trading in the Foreign Exchange Market. *American Economic Review*, 80(2), 181-185.
- Frankel, J. A., & Rose, A. K. 1996. A Panel Project on Purchasing Power Parity: Mean Reversion within and between Countries. *Journal of International Economics*, 40 1-2, 209-224.
- Frankel, J. A., Rose, A. K., & Grossman, G. M. 1995. Empirical Research on Nominal Exchange Rates. In K. Rogoff (Ed.), *Handbook of international economics*. Volume 3 (pp. 1689-1729). Amsterdam; New York and Oxford.
- FRB_St_Louis. 2004. *10-Year Constant Treasury Maturity Rate*. Retrieved 02/06/2004, 2004, from <http://research.stlouisfed.org/fred2/series/DGS10/47/Max>
- Frenkel, J. A. 1976. A Monetary Approach to the Exchange Rate: Doctrinal Aspects and Empirical Evidence. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 78(1-4), 200.
- Frenkel, J. A. 1978. Purchasing Power Parity: Doctrinal perspective and evidence from the 1920's. *Journal of International Economics*, 8(2), 169.
- Frenkel, J. A. 1981. Flexible Exchange Rates, Prices, and the Role of "News": Lessons from the 1970s. *Journal of Political Economy*, 89(4), 665-705.
- Friedman, M. 1953. *The Case for Flexible Exchange Rates*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Froot, K. A. 1990. *Short Rates and Expected Asset Returns*: National Bureau of Economic Research. NBER Working Paper No. 3247.
- Galati, G., & Ho, C. 2003. Macroeconomic News and the Euro/Dollar Exchange Rate. *Economic Notes*, 32(3), 371-398.
- Glen, J. D. 1992. Real Exchange Rates in the Short, Medium, and Long Run. *Journal of International Economics*, 33(1-2), 147-166.
- Goldberg, M. D. 2000. On Empirical Exchange Rate Models: What Does a Rejection of the Symmetry Restriction on Short-Run Interest Rates Mean? *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 19(5), 673-688.
- Groen, J. J. J. 2000. The Monetary Exchange Rate Model as a Long-Run Phenomenon. *Journal of International Economics*, 52(2), 299-319.

Boulter & Sullivan

- Gruen, D. W. R., & 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), 204-219.
- Hakkio, C. S. 1984. A Re-examination of Purchasing Power Parity: A Multi-country and Multi-period Study. *Journal of International Economics*, 17(3-4), 265-277.
- Hakkio, C. S., & Rush, M. 1991. Cointegration: How Short Is the Long Run? *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 10(4), 571-581.
- Hallwood, C. P., & MacDonald, R. 2000. *International money and finance* (Second ed.). Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Hogan, K., Melvin, M., & Roberts, D. J. 1991. Trade Balance News and Exchange Rates: Is There a Policy Signal? *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 10, S90-99.
- Hooper, P., & Morton, J. 1982. Fluctuations in the dollar: A model of nominal and real exchange rate determination. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 1, 39-56.
- Irwin, D. A. 1989. Trade Deficit Announcements, Intervention, and the Dollar. *Economics Letters*, 31(3), 257-262.
- Ito, T., Lyons, R., & Melvin, M. T. 1998. Is There Private Information in the FX Market? The Tokyo Experiment. *Journal of Finance*, 53(5), 1111-1130.
- Johansen, S. 1988. Statistical Analysis of Cointegration Vectors. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 12(2/3), 231-254.
- Johansen, S., & Juselius, K. 1990. Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference on Cointegration--With Applications to the Demand for Money. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 52(2), 169-210.
- Karfakis, C., & Kim, S.-J. 1995. Exchange Rates, Interest Rates and Current Account News: Some Evidence from Australia. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 14(4), 575-595.
- Karfakis, C., & Phipps, A. 1999. Modeling the Australian Dollar-US Dollar Exchange Rate Using Cointegration Techniques. *Review of International Economics*, 7(2), 265-279.
- Kilian, L. 1999. Exchange Rates and Monetary Fundamentals: What Do We Learn from Long-Horizon Regressions? *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 14(5), 491-510.
- Kritzman, M. 1989. Serial Dependence in Currency Returns: Investment Implications. *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 16(1), 96-102.
- Kwiatkowski, D., Phillips, P. C. B., Schmidt, P., & Shin, Y. 1992. Testing the Null Hypothesis of Stationarity against the Alternative of a Unit Root: How Sure Are We That Economic Time Series Have a Unit Root? *Journal of Econometrics*, 54(1-3), 159-178.
- Lee, C. I., Gleason, K. C., & Mathur, I. 2001. Trading Rule Profits in Latin American Currency Spot Rates. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 10(2), 135-156.
- Levin, A., & Lin, C.-F. 1992. *Unit Root Tests in Panel Data: Asymptotic and Finite-Sample Properties*: University of California, San Diego Department of Economics. Working Paper: 92-23.
- Lothian, J. R., & Taylor, M. P. 1996. Real Exchange Rate Behavior: The Recent Float from the Perspective of the Past Two Centuries. *Journal of Political Economy*, 104(3), 488-509.

Boulter & Sullivan

- Lui, Y.-H., & Mole, D. 1998. The Use of Fundamental and Technical Analyses by Foreign Exchange Dealers: Honk Kong Evidence. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 17(3), 535-545.
- Lyons, R. K. 2001. New Perspective on FX Markets: Order-Flow Analysis. *International Finance*, 4(2), 303-320.
- MacDonald, G., Allen, D., & Cruickshank, S. 2002. Purchasing Power Parity: Evidence from a New Panel Test. *Applied Economics*, 34(11), 1319-1324.
- MacDonald, R. 2000, *Economics of Exchange Rates: Theories and Evidence*, Routledge, London.
- MacDonald, R., & Marsh, I. W. 1997. On Fundamentals and Exchange Rates: A Casselian Perspective. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 79(4), 655-664.
- MacDonald, R., & Taylor, M. 1994. The Monetary Model of the Exchange Rate: Long Run Relationships, Short Run Dynamics and How to Beat a Random Walk. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 13(3), 276-290.
- MacDonald, R., & Taylor, M. P. 1992. *Exchange Rate Economics: A Survey*: International Monetary Fund. IMF Staff Papers.
- MacKinnon, J. G. 1996. Numerical Distribution Functions for Unit Root and Cointegration Tests. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 11(6), 601-618.
- Manzur, M. (Ed.). 2003. *Exchange Rates, Interest Rates and Commodity Prices*. UK: Edward Elgar.
- Mark, N. C. 1990. Real and Nominal Exchange Rates in the Long Run: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of International Economics*, 28(1-2), 115-136.
- Mark, N. C. 1995. Exchange Rates and Fundamentals: Evidence on Long-Horizon Predictability. *American Economic Review*, 85(1), 201-218.
- McNown, R., & Wallace, M. 1989. Co-integration Tests for Long Run Equilibrium in the Monetary Exchange Rate Model. *Economics Letters*, 31(3), 263-267.
- McNown, R., & Wallace, M. 1994. Cointegration Tests of the Monetary Exchange Rate Model for Three High-Inflation Economies. *Journal of Money, Credit & Banking*, 26(3), 396.
- Meese, R., & Rogoff, K. 1983. Empirical Exchange Rate Models of the Seventies. *Journal of International Economics*, 14, 3-24.
- Meese, R. A., & Rogoff, K. 1988. Was It Real? The Exchange Rate-Interest Differential Relation over the Modern Floating-Rate Period. *Journal of Finance*, 43(4), 933-948.
- Menkhoff, L. 1997. Examining the Use of Technical Currency Analysis. *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 2(4), 307-318.
- Moore, M. and Roche M. 2006. Solving Exchange Rate PUzzles without sticky Prices or Trade Costs. *Mimeo* May 2006.
- Mills, T. C., & Taylor, M. P. 1989. Random Walk Components in Output and Exchange Rates: Some Robust Tests on UK Data. *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 41(2), 123-135.

Boulter & Sullivan

- Neely, C. J. 1998. Technical Analysis and the Profitability of U.S. Foreign Exchange Intervention. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 80(4), 3-17.
- Oberlechner, T. 2001. Importance of Technical and Fundamental Analysis in the European Foreign Exchange Market. *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 6(1), 81-93.
- Obstfeld, M. 1982. Can We Sterilize? Theory and Evidence. *American Economic Review*, 72(2), 45-50.
- Oh, K.-Y. 1996. Purchasing Power Parity and Unit Root Tests Using Panel Data. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 15(3), 405-418.
- Pedroni, P. 2001. Purchasing Power Parity Tests in Cointegrated Panels. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83(4), 727-731.
- Phillips, P. C. B., & Perron, P. 1987. *Testing for a Unit Root in Time Series Regression*: Yale University. Cowles Foundation Discussion Papers: 795R.
- Pilbeam, K. 1995. The Profitability of Trading in the Foreign Exchange Market: Chartists, Fundamentalists, and Simpletons. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 47(3), 437-452.
- Pippenger, J. 2004. In Search of Overshooting and Bandwagons in Exchange Rates. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 14(1), 87-98.
- Ramsey, J., B.. 1969. Tests for Specification Errors in Classical Linear Regression Analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 31(2), 350-371.
- Rogoff, K. 1996. The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(2), 647.
- Sentana, E., & Wadhvani, S. B. 1992. Feedback Traders and Stock Return Autocorrelations: Evidence from a Century of Daily Data. *Economic Journal*, 102(411), 415-425.
- Sercu, P., Uppal, R., & Van Hulle, C. 1995. The Exchange Rate in the Presence of Transaction Costs: Implications for Tests of Purchasing Power Parity. *Journal of Finance*, 50(4), 1309-1319.
- Shiller, R. J., & Perron, P. 1985. *Testing the Random Walk Hypothesis: Power vs. Frequency of Observation*: National Bureau of Economic Research. Technical Paper: 45.
- Smith, J., & Gruen, D. W. R. 1989. *A Random Walk around the A\$: Expectations, Risk, Interest Rates and Consequence for External Imbalance*: Reserve Bank of Australia. Discussion Paper No. 8906.
- Smith, P. N., & Wickens, M. R. 1986. An Empirical Investigation into the Causes of Failure of the Monetary Model of the Exchange Rate. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 1(2), 143-162.
- Stockman, A. C. 1980. A Theory of Exchange Rate Determination. *Journal of Political Economy*, 88(4), 673-698.
- Swift, R. (2001). Exchange Rates and Commodity Prices: The Case of Australian Metal Exports. *Applied Economics*, 33(6), 745-753.
- Tarditi, A. 1996. *Modelling the Australian Exchange Rate, Long Bond Yield and Inflationary Expectations*: Reserve Bank of Australia. Research Discussion Paper: 9608.

Boulter & Sullivan

- Tawadros, G. B. 2002. Purchasing Power Parity in the Long-Run: Evidence from Australia's Recent Float. *Applied Financial Economics*, 12(9), 625-631.
- Taylor, A. M. 2002. A Century of Purchasing-Power Parity. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84(1), 139-150.
- Taylor, M. 1995. Exchange Rate Modelling and Macro Fundamentals: Failed Partnership or Open Marriage? *British Review of Economic Issues*, 17(42), 1-41.
- Vigfusson, R. 1997. Switching between Chartists and Fundamentalists: A Markov Regime-Switching Approach. *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 2(4), 291-305.
- Webber, A. G. 1997. Australian Commodity Export Pass-through and Feedback Causality from Commodity Prices to the Exchange Rate. *Australian Economic Papers*, 36(68), 55-68.
- White, H. 1980. A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica*, 48, 817-838.
- Yang, J. H. S., & Satchell, S. E. 2002. *The Impact of Technical Analysis on Asset Price Dynamics*: Department of Applied Economics, University of Cambridge. Working Papers in Economics: 219.
- Zumaquero, A. M., & Urrea, R. P. 2002. Purchasing Power Parity: Error Correction Models and Structural Breaks. *Open Economies Review*, 13(1), 5-26.







Appendix 1

Data Sources

Variable	Data Description	Type	Datastream Code
Exchange Rates			
S	AUD / USD(1)	Bid	BBAUDSP(EB)
	AUD / USD(1)	Offer	BBAUDSP(EO)
	USD / EUR(1)	Index	USEURWD
	CAD / USD(1)	Bid	BBCADSP(EB)
	CAD / USD(1)	Offer	BBCADSP(EO)
	USD / GBP(1)	Bid	BBGBPSP(EB)
	USD / GBP(1)	Offer	BBGBPSP(EO)
	JPY / USD(1)	Bid	BBJPYSP(EB)
	JPY / USD(1)	Offer	BBJPYSP(EO)
	CHF / USD(1)	Bid	BBCHFSP(EB)
CHF / USD(1)	Offer	BBCHFSP(EO)	
Interest Rates			
i_c	Australia 11 AM Cash Rate Call - Middle rate	Cash	AUUOFFL
i_{90}	Australia Dealer Bill 90 Day - Middle Rate	90 day	ADBR090
i_{10Y}	Australia Bond Yield 10 Year - Middle Rate	10 year	ABND10Y
i_c^*	US Federal Funds - Middle Rate	Cash	USFEDFD
i_{90}^*	US Bankers Accept. Discount 90 Day - Middle Rate	90 day	USBA90D
i_{10Y}^*	US Treas. Benchmark Bond 10 Yr (DS) - Red. Yield	10 year	USBD10Y
Commodity Prices			
COMPI	Westpac Commodity Futures Index - Price Index		WCFINDX

Appendix 2

Variables: Graph Plots





Appendix 2 contd.


(COMPI) Commodity Price Index

(compi) Log Commodity Price Index

Boulter & Sullivan



(VOL) Volatility Proxy



Variable Descriptive Statistics

	S	s	RiC	RiS	RiL	YGAP	COMPI	compi
Mean	1.461	0.370	0.035	0.036	0.023	0.012	113.124	4.712
Median	1.403	0.339	0.028	0.028	0.020	0.009	108.670	4.688
Maximum	2.071	0.728	0.253	0.136	0.073	0.217	181.350	5.200
Minimum	1.121	0.115	-0.027	-0.008	-0.002	-0.077	79.350	4.374
Std. Dev.	0.200	0.130	0.033	0.033	0.018	0.019	21.642	0.180
Skewness	1.039	0.800	0.872	0.743	0.706	1.220	0.999	0.625
Kurtosis	3.316	2.874	3.640	2.680	2.574	9.707	3.450	2.740
Jarque-Bera	934.38	544.59	730.09	488.97	459.58	10773.39	886.81	344.76
Probability	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Sum	7417.95	1881.01	177.66	181.01	117.52	60.14	574331.10	23920.86
Sum Sq. Dev.	202.17	85.27	5.43	5.45	1.56	1.83	2377373.00	165.27

Appendix 3

Summary of ADF test statistics

*, **, *** denote rejection of the null of stationarity at 10, 5 and 1 percent respectively. All lags are minimised by Schwarz information criteria. P-values are in parentheses. The null hypothesis is of non-stationarity. An intercept is denoted by μ and a trend by π . AIC and SIC values correspond to the estimation (constant, constant and trend, no constant) for which they are minimised.

	ADF - Levels						ADF - First Difference					
	μ	μ & π	-	μ	μ & π	-	μ	μ & π	-	μ	μ & π	-
S	-2.01 (0.284)	-1.89 (0.658)	0.04 (0.696)	AIC	SIC		S	-68.87*** (0.000)	-68.87*** (0.000)	-68.88*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
s	-2.10 (0.243)	-1.98 (0.611)	-0.35 (0.560)	AIC	SIC		s	-68.56*** (0.000)	-68.56*** (0.000)	-68.56*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
RiC	-1.58 (0.494)	-2.17 (0.508)	-0.99 (0.288)	AIC	SIC		RiC	-25.32*** (0.000)	-25.32*** (0.000)	-25.32*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
RiS	-1.28 (0.643)	-1.65 (0.773)	-0.82 (0.363)		AIC SIC		RiS	-71.64*** (0.000)	-71.63*** (0.000)	-71.65*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
RiL	-1.5 (0.535)	-2.91 (0.159)	-1.04 (0.268)		AIC SIC		RiL	-60.37*** (0.000)	-60.36*** (0.000)	-60.37*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
YGAP	-2.61* (0.091)	-2.84 (0.183)	-2.08** (0.036)	AIC	SIC		YGAP	-26.08*** (0.000)	-26.08*** (0.000)	-26.08*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
COMPI	-1.16 (0.693)	-1.06 (0.934)	0.29 (0.769)		AIC SIC		COMPI	-68.74*** (0.000)	-68.74*** (0.000)	-68.75*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
compi	-1.26 (0.651)	-1.15 (0.920)	0.42 (0.805)		AIC SIC		compi	-68.17*** (0.000)	-68.17*** (0.000)	-68.17*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC
VOL	-20.19*** (0.000)	-20.22*** (0.000)	-13.67*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC		VOL	-24.18*** (0.000)	-24.17*** (0.000)	-24.18*** (0.000)	AIC	SIC

Boulter & Sullivan

Phillips Perron and KPSS Test Statistics

*, **, *** denote rejection of the null hypothesis at 10, 5 and 1 percent respectively. PP tests have the null of non-stationarity whilst KPSS tests have the null of stationarity. An intercept is denoted by μ and a trend by π . AIC and SIC values correspond to the estimation (constant, constant and trend, no constant) for which they are minimised. For both tests, spectral estimation is done with a Bartlett kernel and bandwidth is selected using a Newey-West procedure. See Phillips & Perron (1987) and Kwiatkowski *et al.* (1992).

	Phillips Perron - Levels			KPSS - Levels		
	μ	μ & π	-	μ	μ & π	-
S	-2.00 (0.288)	-1.90 (0.657)	0.05 (0.698)	AIC	SIC	
s	-2.13 (0.232)	-1.98 (0.611)	-0.35 (0.559)	AIC	SIC	
RiC	-5.10*** (0.000)	-7.01*** (0.000)	-3.03*** (0.002)	AIC SIC		
RiS	-1.32 (0.623)	-1.73 (0.738)	-0.84 (0.350)		AIC SIC	
RiL	-1.59 (0.488)	-3.43** (0.048)	-1.06 (0.262)	AIC	SIC	
YGAP	-10.13*** (0.000)	-10.80*** (0.000)	-7.32*** (0.000)	AIC SIC		
COMPI	-1.16 (0.692)	-1.06 (0.934)	0.28 (0.767)	AIC SIC		
compi	-1.18 (0.684)	-1.06 (0.934)	0.45 (0.812)		AIC SIC	
VOL	-79.28*** (0.000)	-79.17*** (0.000)	-94.43*** (0.000)	SIC	AIC	
S						3.80*** 0.81*** AIC SIC
s						3.77*** 0.81*** AIC SIC
RiC						5.65*** 1.22*** AIC SIC
RiS						5.68*** 1.29*** AIC SIC
RiL						6.41*** 0.58*** AIC SIC
YGAP						3.69*** 1.36*** AIC SIC
COMPI						2.01*** 0.47*** AIC SIC
compi						2.03*** 0.49*** AIC SIC
VOL						0.61** 0.58 AIC SIC

Boulter & Sullivan

Appendix 4

Engle Granger 2 step ADF Tests for Stationarity of Residuals (Null hypothesis is no cointegration)

*,**,*** denotes rejection at 1,5 and 10 percent respectively. All critical values are derived from MacKinnon (1996) computer program based on a sample size of 5077. Source: <http://www.queensu.econ.edu/faculty/mackinnon>

	Log Nominal Exchange Rate/Commodity Prices			Minimised Criterion		
	Constant	Constant & Trend	No Constant	Constant	Constant & Trend	No Constant
s, RiC	-2.39 (0.146)	-2.32 (0.424)	-2.39** (0.017)			AIC SIC
s, RiS	-2.32 (0.165)	-2.22 (0.477)	-2.32** (0.020)			AIC SIC
s, RiL	-2.63* (0.087)	-2.50 (0.327)	-2.63*** (0.008)			AIC SIC
s, YGAP	-2.13 (0.234)	-2.07 (0.561)	-2.13** (0.032)	AIC		SIC
s, compi	-3.11** (0.026)	-3.17* (0.091)	-3.11*** (0.002)			AIC SIC
s, RiC, RiL	-2.73	-2.59	-2.73			AIC SIC
s, RiS, RiL	-2.95	-2.82	-2.95			AIC SIC
s, RiS, YGAP	-2.90	-2.85	-2.90	AIC		SIC
s, RiC, compi	-3.33* (0.026)	-3.38 (0.091)	-3.33 (0.002)			AIC SIC
s, RiS, compi	-3.11* (0.026)	-3.12 (0.091)	-3.11 (0.002)			AIC SIC
s, RiL, compi	-3.36** (0.026)	-3.34 (0.091)	-3.36 (0.002)			AIC SIC
s, YGAP, compi	-3.11* (0.026)	-3.16 (0.091)	-3.11 (0.002)			AIC SIC
s, RiC, RiL, compi	-3.39	-3.35	-3.39			AIC SIC
s, RiS, RiL, compi	-3.53	-3.65	-3.53			AIC SIC

Boulter & Sullivan

Appendix 5

Summary of Johansen Cointegration Tests (λ_{Trace} / λ_{Max} Statistics)

Numbers are representative of cointegrating vectors significant at five percent. An intercept is represented by α and a trend by t. These may enter either the Cointegrating equation (CE) or Vector autoregression (VAR). See EvIEWS (2002) for a detailed analysis of exact specifications.

Log Nominal Exchange Rates/Commodity Prices				
Deterministic Data Trend	None	None	Linear	Linear
CE	-	α	α	α
	-	-	-	t
VAR	-	-	α	α
	-	-	-	-
s, RiC	0 1	1 1	2 2	1 1
s, RiS	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
s, RiL	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
s, YGAP	1 1	1 1	2 2	1 1
s, compi	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
s, RiC, RiL	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
s, RiS, RiL	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
s, RiS, YGAP	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
s, RiC, compi	0 0	0 0	1 0	1 1
s, RiS, compi	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
s, RiL, compi	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
s, YGAP, compi	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
s, RiC, RiL, compi	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
s, RiS, RiL, compi	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0

Boulter & Sullivan

Appendix 6

Eviews Output

Cointegrating Regression

Dependent Variable: LS
 Method: Least Squares
 Date: 10/11/04 Time: 00:13
 Sample: 1 5077
 Included observations: 5077

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	2.802945	0.033064	84.77427	0.0000
RIC	-0.312557	0.039173	-7.978790	0.0000
LCOMPI	-0.513945	0.007099	-72.39510	0.0000
R-squared	0.553796	Mean dependent var		0.370497
Adjusted R-squared	0.553620	S.D. dependent var		0.129610
S.E. of regression	0.086595	Akaike info criterion		-2.054562
Sum squared resid	38.04825	Schwarz criterion		-2.050702
Log likelihood	5218.505	F-statistic		3148.742
Durbin-Watson stat	0.006350	Prob(F-statistic)		0.000000

Error-correction Model – First Difference Specification

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
ect_{t-1}	-0.0039	0.0010	-3.8204	0.0001
VOL	11.4048	0.6577	17.3393	0.0000
VOL_{t-1}	1.3213	0.6380	2.0711	0.0384
VOL_{t-2}	-5.5477	0.6587	-8.4226	0.0000
RIS_{t-1}	-0.1632	0.0752	-2.1707	0.0300
RIS_{t-2}	0.1568	0.0751	2.0878	0.0369
$\Delta compi_{t-1}$	-0.0402	0.0125	-3.2166	0.0013
R-squared	0.06607	Mean dependent var		3.30E-05
Adjusted R-squared	0.064964	S.D. dependent var		0.006522
S.E. of regression	0.006307	Akaike info criterion		7.292988
Sum squared resid	0.201585	Schwarz criterion		7.283979
Log likelihood	18512.96	Durbin-Watson stat		1.968647

Boulter & Sullivan

Appendix 7

Imposing symmetry restrictions on interest rates coefficients by modelling them as relative factors is a contested assumption, with evidence showing that it is an erroneous imposition (MacDonald & Taylor (1994), Goldberg (2000)).^{xviii} The overnight interest differentials plausibility in the cointegrating equation depends on the restrictions that the domestic and foreign interest rates have symmetrical effects on the exchange rate. By definition, the differential form has arbitrarily imposed equal coefficient magnitudes for domestic and foreign rates based on monetary and interest rate parity theories. To test if this restriction is warranted, an unrestricted version of the long run equation is estimated, with domestic and foreign interest rates entering as separate variables. This produced:

$$S = 2.17 - 0.364RICA_t - 0.6914RICUS_t - 0.0056COMPI_t$$

(.011) (.068) (.141) (.0001)

$$s = 2.69 - 0.176RICA_t - 0.51RICUS_t - 0.484compi_t$$

(.034) (.041) (.084) (.008)

RiCA and RiCUS denote the Australian and US overnight interest rates respectively. Standard errors are in parentheses. All variables remain significant at one percent, although the exclusion of a differential restriction leads both interest rates to have the same coefficient signs.^{xix} This outcome negates both the flexible and sticky price monetary models, but is not fully unexpected given the high multicollinearity between the series. Formal t-tests confirm rejection that the coefficients are of equal magnitude.

Goldberg (2000) shows symmetry restrictions rest on the assumptions of imperfect capital mobility and rational expectations. Another less complex interpretation can be taken if interest rates are viewed as the price of bonds (or financial assets).^{xx} Then, it can be shown that a change in exchange rates resulting from an interest rate differential shock can be apportioned to domestic and foreign interest rates in a manner that depends on market power in the respective bond.^{xxi} For interest rates, it implies changes in the Australian exchange rate resulting from interest rate differentials would largely derive from US side shocks as they have larger market power. Therefore, the rejection of symmetry is in fact partially consistent within this framework even though it is not so with monetary theory. This issue is important when interpreting the results of the model presented in section L above.

Boulter & Sullivan

Appendix 8

Commodity Price Weights*			
All items index; per cent			
	Current weights 1994/95	New weights 2001/02	Change Percentage points
Rural commodities	33.2	29.1	-4.1
Wheat	5.5	8.3	+2.8
Beef and veal	9.6	7.9	-1.7
Wool	8.6	4.1	-4.5
Cotton	2.3	2.8	+0.5
Sugar	5.2	2.5	-2.8
Barley	1.0	1.9	+0.9
Canola	-	1.0	+1.0
Rice	1.0	0.5	-0.5
Base metals	15.0	15.7	+0.7
Aluminium	8.6	8.1	-0.5
Copper	2.7	2.8	+0.0
Nickel	1.4	2.6	+1.2
Zinc	1.2	1.5	0.2
Lead	1.1	0.7	-0.3
Other resources	51.8	55.3	+3.4
Coking coal	13.8	14.7	+0.9
Steaming coal	9.4	9.7	+0.3
Gold	16.3	9.4	-6.9
Iron ore	9.3	9.3	+0.0
Alumina	-	7.4	+7.4
LNG	3.0	4.8	+1.8

*Based on export values

Source: Reserve Bank of Australia Bulletin October 2003 p.8.

