Center for Research in Economic Analysis
University of Luxembourg

Real exchanges rates, commodities prices and structural factors in developing countries

Vincent Bodart, IRES, Université catholique de Louvain
Bertrand Candelon, University of Maastricht
Jean-François Carpantier, CREA, Université du Luxembourg

UNIVERSITÉ DU
LUXEMBOURG

REAL EXCHANGES RATES, COMMODITY PRICES AND STRUCTURAL FACTORS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Vincent Bodart[1]   Bertrand Candelon[2]   Jean-Francois Carpantier[3,4]

May 15, 2013

Abstract

This paper provides new empirical evidence about the relationship that may exist between real exchange rates and commodity prices in developing countries that are specialized in the export of a main primary commodity. It investigates how structural factors like the exchange rate regime, the degree of financial and trade openness, the degree of export concentration and the type of the commodity exports affect the strength of the commodity price-real exchange rate dependence.

Keywords: Real exchange rates; commodity prices; exchange rate regime; financial openness; dynamic panel analysis

1   Introduction

This paper provides new empirical evidence about the relationship that may exist between real exchange rates and commodity prices in developing countries that are specialized in the export of a main primary commodity. It is largely documented that for many developing countries that are dependent on the production of primary commodities, commodity price shocks may have important economic implications, either positive or negative[1]. As shown by the literature on the "Dutch disease"[2], the principal channel through which commodity price shocks may affect a country's economic performances is the real exchange rate. For that reason, the dependence of real exchange rates on commodity prices (or, more generally, on terms of trade) has been the subject of numerous empirical studies, that usually find that

---

[1]Université Catholique de Louvain, IRES, B-1348 Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium.

[2]University of Maastricht, Department of Economics, PO Box 616, MD6200 Maastricht, The Netherlands.

[3]*Corresponding author.* University of Luxembourg, CREA, L-1511 Luxembourg.

[1]For instance, the literature on the "Natural Resource Curse" suggests that increases in commodity prices have adverse, rather than positive, effects on the economic growth of commodity producing countries. For a recent survey on this topic, see Frankel (2010)

[2]The term "Dutch disease" usually refers to the decline in the production of several sectors that is caused by a favorable shock such as a large natural resource discovery or a rise in the world market price of a primary commodity. The main source of the decline in sectoral output is an appreciation of the real exchange rate. For a nice non-technical discussion of the "Dutch disease" phenomenon, see Brahmbhatt, Canuto, and Vostroknutova (2010). For more detailed analyses, see Corden (1984) and Corden and Neary (1982).

increases in the world price of commodity prices are associated with an appreciation of the real exchange rate[3]. With a very few exceptions, the focus of these studies is strictly limited to the estimation of the real exchange rate response to commodity price shocks. However, what determines the magnitude of the real exchange rate reaction is not examined in these studies. It is the purpose of our paper to fill this gap. We do that by exploring the role played by several structural factors in shaping the real exchange rate - commodity price relationship.

Our analysis focuses on five structural features : the exchange rate regime, the degree of financial openness, the degree of trade openness, the degree of export diversification and the type of the main commodity exported by the country. From a policy stand point, understanding the role of these factors is particularly important given that many developing countries have been or are faced with questions such as which exchange rate regime to choose, how and by how much open the capital account, and whether and how reduce the concentration of exports on a few products. As shown in the next Section, the choice of these factors is also dictated by theoretical considerations.

Despite its narrow focus, our analysis is at the cross-section of two important topics of the literature about the determinants of economic growth in developing countries. As reminded above, the first one is about the impact that commodity price shocks may have on the economic performances of developing countries that are specialized in the export of primary products as many small African countries are. The second topic is about the influence of structural factors such as the exchange rate regime or the degree of financial openness on economic growth.

Existing empirical evidence on what determines the strength of the real exchange rate - commodity price relationship is very scarce. To our knowledge, it is almost limited to Broda (2004) who examines whether the response of real exchange rates to terms-of-trade shocks differ systematically across exchange rate regimes[4]. He shows that in response to a fall in terms-of-trade, there is a small and slow depreciation of the real exchange rate in developing countries with a currency peg but a large and immediate real exchange rate depreciation in country where the exchange rate is floating. His analysis also concludes that the response of the real exchange rate does not differ significantly across regimes when the terms-of-trade shock is positive. The role played by structural factors in shaping the relationship between real exchange rates and commodity prices is also evoked by Chen and Rogoff (2003) who estimate such a relationship for Australia, Canada and New Zealand. They find that the relation is strong for Australia and New Zealand but less robust for Canada, and they suggest that this difference is due to the fact that the Canadian dollar is de facto tied to the US dollar, while the Australia and NZ dollars are floating. A second explanation that they put forward is that commodities constitute a smaller share of the Canadian exports compared to Australia

---

[3]Recent studies are Chen and Rogoff (2003), Broda (2004), Cashin, Cespedes, and Sahay (2004), Coudert, Couharde, and Mignon (2008) and Bodart, Candelon, and Carpantier (2012). Coudert, Couharde, and Mignon (2008) provides a comprehensive survey of these studies.

[4]An analysis similar to that of Broda (2004) has been realized recently for 9 East Asian countries by Dai and Chia (2008) and for Latin American economies by Aizenman, Edwards, and Riera-Crichton (2011). Edwards (2011) and Edwards and Yeyati (2003) also examine empirically the economic impact of terms of trade disturbances under alternative exchange rate regimes, but their evidence is limited to the impact on GDP growth.

and New Zealand. Their tentative explanations are however not tested formally.

Admittedly, the issue that we intend to explore in this paper is empirically relevant only if there is enough variation across countries about the impact of commodity prices on real exchange rates. Evidence in support of our analysis is provided in Table 1 where we report, for 33 developing countries that produce a primary commodity that counts for at least 20 percent of their total exports, estimates of the long-run (cointegrating) relationship between their real exchange rate and the world market price of their main commodity export. The estimates of the long-run commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate are significant for 17 countries. More importantly, we observe that they vary considerably across countries, ranging from -0.17 (Dominica Republic) to 10.39 (Ghana), with a median value of 0.21[5]. So we can proceed further with our analysis, whose purpose is thus to find out what factors explain these differences across countries.

To achieve our analysis, we use panel data covering 33 small developing countries over the period 1980-2007. Our main findings can be summarized as follows. First, we find evidence that the real exchange rate of countries specialized in the production of a main primary commodity is related in the long-run to the international price of the main commodity that they export. Second, we find evidence suggesting that the long-run commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate varies with the exchange rate regime, the degree of trade openness, the degree of export diversification and the type of the primary commodity that is exported. Conversely, our evidence suggests that the degree of financial openness does not affect the long-run response of real exchange rates to international commodity price disturbances.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we outline a simple theoretical model to illustrate how the exchange rate regime, the degree of financial and trade openness, the extent of export concentration and the type of commodity exported may affect the relation between a country's real exchange rate and the world market price of its primary commodity exports. Section 3 describes the data while the econometric methodology and the results are presented in Section 4. Conclusions and policy implications are drawn in Section 5.

2 Theoretical considerations

The purpose of this Section is to illustrate with a simple theoretical framework how structural factors like the exchange rate regime or the degree of financial openness may affect the relationship between the real exchange rate of a small commodity exporting country and the price of the main commodity exported by that country. To do so, we present a model of a small open economy which has the advantage of being simple enough to be analytically tractable but rich enough to provide interesting insights[6].

---

[5]To our knowledge, the only published study that provides estimates of the commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate for a large number of countries is Cashin, Cespedes, and Sahay (2004), who report long-run (cointegrating) elasticity estimates for 19 countries. Their elasticity estimates range from 0.16 to 2.03, with a median value of 0.42

[6]The model developed in this Section is derived from the model developed by Gregorio and Wolf (1994) and by Cashin, Cespedes, and Sahay (2004). For a detailed presentation of small open economy models with tradable and non tradable goods, see Dornbusch (1980) and Obstfeld and Rogoff (1996).

The main features of the model are as follows. It is first assumed that the domestic economy produces three goods, a primary commodity and a manufacturing good, which are both tradable, and a nontradable good that is only available to domestic consumers. The inclusion of two tradable goods will enable us to investigate how commodity specialization affects the commodity price - real exchange rate relationship. Domestic households consume the nontradable good and an imported consumer good. They therefore derive their utility from the consumption of the nontradable good produced domestically and the imported foreign good. An intermediate good is also imported from the rest of the world to be used as input in the production of the domestic manufacturing good. The primary commodity good is an input in the production of both the domestic manufacturing good and the imported intermediate good. Its world market price is given to domestic producers. Wages are the sole source of income for domestic consumers since capital is owned exclusively by foreign investors. In the benchmark version of the model, we assume that capital is perfectly mobile internationally. It is also assumed that the nominal exchange rate is fixed. These two assumptions will be successively relaxed at the end of the Section. As our empirical analysis is only concerned with the long-run relationship that may exist between real exchange rates and commodity prices, our model has no dynamics[7].

In the detailed description of the model that follows, the commodity, manufacturing, nontradable, imported intermediate and consumer goods are denoted respectively by the suffixes C, M, N, I and F.

On the production side, it is assumed that the primary commodity (Y_c) is produced with a technology that combines labor (L_c) and capital (K_c). Following what is done in Cashin, Cespedes, and Sahay (2004), we assume that the production of the domestic exported manufacturing good (Y_m) is obtained by assembling two intermediary inputs. The first is the primary commodity (Y_{c_m}) and the second is the intermediate good produced by the rest of the world (Y_{i_m}). The production of the nontradable good (Y_n) only requires labor (L_n). Labor is perfectly mobile across the commodity and the nontradable sectors while capital is specific to the primary commodity sector and the intermediate good I_m to the manufacturing sector. The production function is assumed to be Cobb-Douglas for the two exportable goods and linear in labor for the nontradable good:

$$
\begin{align}
Y_c &= a_c L_c^{\alpha} K_c^{1-\alpha} \tag{1}\\
Y_m &= a_m Y_{c_m}^{\beta} Y_{i_m}^{1-\beta} \tag{2}\\
Y_n &= a_n L_n \tag{3}
\end{align}
$$

where a_c, a_m and a_n are exogenous productivity factors, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < \beta < 1$.

Regarding the foreign economy, it is assumed that it produces two goods. The first is a final consumption good (Y_f^*), whose price is treated as exogenous. The second is an intermediate

---

[7]As shown in details by Corden (1984), we are conscious that the conclusions delivered by small open economy models about the determination of the real exchange rate are very much dependent on several assumptions, in particular those about the number of sectors, the technology of production in each sector and the degree of factor mobility across sectors and countries. These issues are however neglected here as our purpose is simply to have a framework that can illustrate how structural factors influence the determination of the real exchange rate.

good (Y_i^*) which is produced with a Cobb-Douglas technology that combines the primary commodity good Y_{c_i} and labor L^*:

$$Y_i = a_i Y_{c_i}^\gamma L^{*1-\gamma} \tag{4}$$

with $0 < \gamma < 1$.

It is assumed that, in the long run, the law of one price holds for all the tradable goods:

$$P_j = E P_j^* \text{ for } j = c, m, f \text{ and } i \tag{5}$$

where E is the nominal exchange rate (defined as the number of units of domestic currency per one unit of the foreign currency) and P_j^* refers to the foreign price of good j. P_c^*, P_i^* and P_f^* are exogenously given to the domestic economy. Conversely, we assume that the domestic economy is price-maker for the manufacturing good that it produces[8].

Let's denote w the wage rate paid to domestic labor, w^* the wage rate paid to foreign labor (treated as exogenous) and r the domestic rate of interest. In the benchmark version of the model, the domestic rate of interest is equal to the foreign rate of interest and it is therefore exogenous[9].

From standard profit maximization, we can derive the following expressions relating the price of each good to the price of the production factors:

$$P_c = \left(\frac{\psi_c}{a_c}\right) w^\alpha r^{1-\alpha} \tag{6}$$

$$P_m = \left(\frac{\psi_m}{a_m}\right) P_c^\beta P_i^{1-\beta} \tag{7}$$

$$P_n = \frac{w}{a_n} \tag{8}$$

$$P_i^* = \left(\frac{\psi_i}{a_i}\right) P_c^{*\gamma} w^{*1-\gamma} \tag{9}$$

where $\psi_c = \alpha^{-\alpha}(1-\alpha)^{-(1-\alpha)}$, $\psi_m = \beta^{-\beta}(1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}$ and $\psi_i = \gamma^{-\gamma}(1-\gamma)^{-(1-\gamma)}$.

On the demand side, domestic households consume two goods, the nontradable good produced domestically and an imported consumer good. Individual preferences are given by a Cobb-Douglas utility function. Denoting C_n, the consumption of the nontradable good, and C_f, the consumption of the imported good, we have :

$$U = \psi_u C_n^\phi C_f^{1-\phi} \tag{10}$$

where $\psi_u = \phi^{-\phi}(1-\phi)^{-(1-\phi)}$ and $0 < \phi < 1$.

---

[8]The assumption that developing countries can be price maker for manufacturing goods is taken for convenience and is not central in the model. Notwithstanding, such feature has been documented and discussed in Easterly and Reshef (2010) where they observe that there is "substantial specialization across African countries in differentiated products".

[9]The interest rate becomes endogenous at the end of the Section where we relax the assumption of free international mobility of capital

The consumer has thus constant expenditures shares ϕ and $(1 - \phi)$ on the nontradable and imported goods. Letting $B = w(L_c + L_n)$ denote the consumer income, we have the following demand functions:

$$C_n = \phi \frac{B}{P_n} \tag{11}$$

$$C_f = (1 - \phi) \frac{B}{P_f} \tag{12}$$

where the domestic price of the imported good, P_f, is determined by the law of one price: $P_f = EP_f^*$, and the domestic economy takes P_f^* as exogenous.

The model of the domestic economy is closed by the equilibrium conditions for the nontradable good market and the labour market, respectively:

$$C_n = Y_n \tag{13}$$

$$L = L_c + L_n \tag{14}$$

where L, the labor supply, is fixed and exogenously given.

Finally, we look at the determination of the real exchange rate q. As is well known, the real exchange rate can be defined in many different ways[10]. One definition relates the price of the nontradable goods to the price of the tradable goods. This approach is however difficult to explore empirically since such data are either not available or weakly reliable for small developing countries as the ones in our sample. We therefore opt to define the real exchange rate, in a very common way, as the ratio between the domestic consumer price index (P) and the foreign consumer price index expressed in the domestic currency (EP^*). Given that $P = P_n{}^\phi (EP_f^*)^{1-\phi}$ and by assuming that $P^* = P_m^{*\zeta} P_f^{*1-\zeta}$ (the foreign economy consumes a share ζ of the domestic manufacturing good Y_m and a share $1 - \zeta$ of its foreign good Y_f), we have:

$$q = \frac{P}{EP^*} = P_n{}^\phi P_f^{*\zeta-\phi} P_m^{-\zeta} E^{\zeta-\phi} \tag{15}$$

By combining Equations (6) and (8), and the law of one price for P_c, we can express P_n as a function of the exogenous variables P_c^*, E and r. The core mechanism behind the adjustment of the nontradable price is related to the labor mobility across commodity and nontradable sectors. Since the commodity price determines, jointly with the interest rate (see Equation (6)), the domestic wage rate, the commodity price also determines the price of the nontradable good, which is proportional to the domestic wage rate (see Equation (8)). The price of the foreign consumption good P_f^* is exogenous. Regarding the price of the manufacturing good P_m, by combining Equations (7) and (9) and the law of one price for P_c, we can express P_m as a function of the exogenous variables P_c^*, w^* and E. The price of the manufacturing good thus depends directly, through its inputs, on the price of the commodity. It can thus easily be shown that:

$$q = P_c^{*\phi/\alpha-\zeta(\beta+(1-\beta)\gamma)} E^{\phi/\alpha-\phi} r^{\phi(\alpha-1)/\alpha} P_f^{*\zeta-\phi} w^{*-\zeta(1-\gamma)(1-\beta)} h \tag{16}$$

---

[10]For a discussion of the alternative definitions of the real exchange rates, see for instance Edwards (1989) and Chinn (2006).

where $h = (\psi_c^{-1} a_c a_n^{-\alpha})^{\phi/\alpha} (\psi_m a_m^{-1} (\psi_i a_i^{-1})^{1-\beta})^{-\zeta}$ and where P_c^*, E, r, P_f^* and w^* are exogenous, and so we have:

$$\Sigma(q; P_c^*) = \phi/\alpha - \zeta(\beta + (1-\beta)\gamma) \tag{17}$$

where the symbol Σ denotes an elasticity. We can observe that five parameters shape the size of the commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate. Firstly, ϕ stands for the share of the nontradable good in the domestic consumption. By determining the domestic wage rate, the commodity price determines the price of the nontradable good, which is at the numerator of the real exchange rate definition. Secondly, α denotes the share of the labor input in the commodity good production. The higher the share of labor, the smaller the impact of a commodity price shock on the domestic wage rate and, in turn, on the real exchange rate. The third parameter, β, measures the share of the commodity good in the production of the manufacturing good. Since this good is consumed abroad, the larger is β, the larger is the impact of a commodity price shock on the foreign consumer price index. The fourth parameter, ζ, stands for the share of the manufacturing good in the foreign consumption. The larger its share, the larger the impact of a commodity price shock on the foreign consumption price index. Finally, γ denotes the share of the commodity good in the production of the intermediate foreign good. The larger its share, the larger the impact of a commodity price shock on the price of the intermediate good, so the larger is the impact on the price of the manufacturing good and, consequently, the larger is the impact on the foreign consumer price index.

It is worth noting that, according to expression (17), a commodity price shock may have a positive or negative impact on the real exchange rate. It affects positively the real exchange rate by raising the price of the nontradable good, but affects negatively the real exchange rate by raising the price of the manufacturing good consumed abroad. More precisely, the impact on the real exchange rate is negative when $\frac{\phi}{\zeta} < \alpha(\beta + (1-\beta)\gamma)$. In other words, if the share of the manufacturing good in the foreign consumption ζ is large compared to the share of the nontradable good in the domestic consumption ϕ, the effect of a commodity price on the real exchange rate might be negative. This will happen only in the cases where ϕ is small and α, β, ζ and γ are large.

With the help of this simple framework, we now explore the role played by structural factors in the determination of the commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate. We consider successively five factors: the type of the exportable commodity, the degree of trade openness, the degree of export specialization, the degree of financial openness and the exchange rate regime.

2.1 Commodity type

The typicity of commodities can be captured through different dimensions: exhaustibility, "storability", seasonality, etc. We here consider that what makes a particular commodity different from another one is its technology of production. For instance, it seems reasonable to consider that the production of agricultural commodities is more labor intensive than the production of mineral commodities. We therefore limit our analysis about the impact of the commodity type by examining how the degree of labor intensity α affects the elasticity between q and P_c^*. From the analysis above and Expression (17), it turns out that the elasticity is a negative function of α. The source of this negative impact comes from the dependence of

the domestic wage rate to commodity prices. As stated in Equation (6), the larger the labor intensity of the commodity sector (the larger α), the smaller the impact of a commodity price shock on the wage w. Since the real exchange rate depends positively on the price of the nontradable good, which in turn depends positively on the domestic wage rate, we find that the labor intensity decreases the real exchange rate elasticity to commodity price shocks.

Our model therefore suggests that the impact of international commodity price shocks on the real exchange rate will be lower for countries that are specialized in the export of a commodity whose production is more labor intensive (e.g. agricultural commodities) than for countries which produce capital-intensive commodities (e.g. mineral goods).

2.2 Degree of trade openness

The degree of trade openness in our model can be captured by the parameter ϕ, which measures the share of the nontradable good, compared to the foreign imported good, in total domestic consumption. It follows from our model that the higher is the degree of trade openness (the lower is ϕ), the lower is the response (in absolute value) of q in response to variations of world commodity prices. Since the nontradable good is the most reactive to commodity price shock, it is not a surprise that trade diversification reduces the response of the real exchange rate.

2.3 Export diversification

The export diversification effect is captured in our analysis by comparing the effect of a commodity price shock in an economy producing two tradable goods: the commodity and the manufacturing good (our benchmark model), and in an economy specialized in the production of a sole tradable good: the commodity. In this later case, the real exchange rate defined in Equation (15) is replaced by:

$$q = \frac{P}{EP^*} = P_n{}^{\phi} P_f{}^{*-\phi} E^{-\phi} \tag{18}$$

The elasticity of the real exchange rate to a commodity price shock then becomes:

$$\Sigma(q; P_c^*) = \phi/\alpha \tag{19}$$

We thus find that a commodity price shock in an economy exclusively specialized in the export of a commodity good has a larger effect on the real exchange rate ($\Sigma(q; P_c^*) = \phi/\alpha$) than in an economy diversifying its exports with a manufacturing good ($\Sigma(q; P_c^*) = \phi/\alpha - \zeta(\beta + (1-\beta)\gamma)$). Diversification (through the rise of the manufacturing sector) so reduces the sensibility of the real exchange rate to commodity prices fluctuations.

2.4 Financial openness

Financial openness is given by the degree of international capital mobility. The model in its benchmark version assumes that capital, which is fully owned by foreign investors, can flow over borders without restrictions so that the domestic interest rate r is equal to the (exogenously given) international interest rate r^*.

We now consider the case where the capital no longer freely moves from one country to the other. In this context, the domestic interest rate becomes endogenous and depends on the amount of capital that is available. The nontradable price, which appears in the real exchange rate definition (see Equation (15)), can now be expressed as a function of the exogenous variables K_c, L, E and P_c^*. By combining the definition of the consumer income, the law of one price and Equations (1), (3), (7), (8), (9), (11), (13) and (14), it can be shown that the real exchange rate is now determined as follows:

$$q = P_c^{*\phi - \zeta(\beta + (1-\beta)\gamma)} P_f^{*\zeta - \phi} w^{*-\zeta(1-\gamma)(1-\beta)} L^{-\phi(1-\alpha)} K_c^{\phi(1-\alpha)} h' \tag{20}$$

where $h' = (\alpha a_c a_n^{-1}(1-\phi)^{-(1-\alpha)})^\phi (\psi_m a_m^{-1}(\psi_i a_i^{-1})^{1-\beta})^{-\zeta}$,

and so we have:

$$\Sigma(q; P_c^*) = \phi - \zeta(\beta + (1-\beta)\gamma) \tag{21}$$

By comparing expressions (17) and (21)), it turns out that financial openness gives rise to a higher reaction of the real exchange rate to commodity price shocks. Financial closeness isolates the real exchange rates from international commodity price shocks. It occurs in the model through the equality between the interest rate and the marginal productivity of capital (which is specific to the commodity sector). If the capital stock cannot increase in response to a positive commodity price shock, the domestic interest rate increases and so the domestic wage rate increases by less than it would do if capital was freely mobile. This reduces the impact on the nontradable good price and, hence, on the real exchange rate.

The analysis in this Subsection therefore suggests that the response of the real exchange rate to a commodity price shock is more pronounced in more financially open economies.

2.5 Exchange rate regime

As discussed in the conclusion of Chen and Rogoff (2003), the exchange rate regime may have an impact on the dependence between commodity prices and real exchange rates. In our benchmark model, the exchange rate E is fixed. We now relax this assumption and allow for some flexibility in the exchange rate by considering that the nominal exchange rate adjusts to commodity price shocks. More precisely, following a proposal made by Frankel (2003), we examine the case where the domestic monetary authorities peg the price of the commodity in terms of the domestic currency or, equivalently, set the value of the domestic currency in terms of the commodity that is exported[11]. Formally, the flexibility of the nominal exchange rate is introduced by setting $E = P_c^{*-\omega}$ where $0 \leq \omega \leq 1$. If $\omega = 0$, the exchange rate regime is fixed and E is constant. If $\omega \neq 0$, the regime is flexible as the nominal exchange rate adjusts to offset commodity price shocks; when international commodity price shocks are fully offset ($\omega = 1$), $E = P_c^{*-1}$. In this new framework, the commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate becomes:

$$\Sigma(q; P_c^*) = \phi/\alpha - \zeta(\beta + (1-\beta)\gamma) - \omega(\phi/\alpha - \phi) \tag{22}$$

---

[11]Frankel (2003) argues that this particular exchange rate regime, that he denominates the "Peg the Export Price" rule (or PEP rule), delivers crucial advantages for countries "that are specialized in the production of a particular mineral or agricultural product": the anchor of a peg and the accommodation of a float. A complete motivation of the PEP monetary regime can be found in Frankel (2003)

Three cases can be examined. If $\omega = 0$, the exchange rate regime is fixed and the elasticity is the one reported by Expression (17). If $\omega = 1$, the elasticity becomes: $\Sigma(q; P_c^*) = \phi - \zeta(\beta + (1-\beta)\gamma)$ and is smaller than in the previous case. It must be noticed that, despite the fact that the nominal exchange rate adjusts to keep constant the domestic currency price of the commodity, the elasticity is non-zero. This comes from the fact that, even if P_c and so, P_n, are unchanged, the other prices remain affected by the change in P_c^*, either directly or indirectly through the adjustment of E. In the intermediate case $0 < \omega < 1$), the more flexible the exchange rate (the larger ω), the lower the elasticity.

The results of this Subsection, based on a particular case of nominal exchange rate flexibility, therefore suggest that flexible regimes tend to isolate real exchange rates from commodity price shocks[12].

3 Data

In our empirical investigation, we focus on developing and emerging countries that are specialized in the export of a main commodity. We examine whether their real exchange rate is related to the world market price of their main commodity export and whether the relationship is dependent on structural factors. To address those questions, we use annual data covering the period 1980-2007[13]. The selection of the countries and the dataset are discussed in this Section. Data sources are provided in the Appendix.

3.1 Selection of countries and commodities

Our dataset is composed only of countries that are specialized in the export of a leading commodity. Using the results of Bodart, Candelon, and Carpantier (2012), we consider that a country is specialized in the export of a main commodity if that commodity accounts for at least 20 percent of its total exports[14]. From an initial sample of 65 developing and emerging countries that, according to the IMF, are considered as commodity producing countries[15], we found 33 countries that satisfy that criteria. The selected countries are listed in Table 1. We indicate in front of each country what is its main commodity export and what is the share of that commodity in the total exports of the country[16]. One can notice that our dataset is mainly composed of African and Latin American countries and include 12 different commodities. More details about the selection of countries are given in the Appendix.

---

[12]Other, and more sophisticated, rules guiding the flexibility of the exchange rates could be examined but this would go beyond the scope of this paper, whose focus is mainly empirical.

[13]The end of the sample period is set in 2007 because data, on the classification of exchange rate regimes that was most relevant, are only available until 2007.

[14]Bodart, Candelon, and Carpantier (2012) finds that a commodity specialization of at least 20 percent is necessary to have cointegration between the real exchange rate and the international price of the leading commodity export

[15]It is the same set of countries as in Cashin, Cespedes, and Sahay (2004), to which we added oil producing countries.

[16]The share is measured as an annual average over the period 1988-2007.

3.2 Real exchange rates and commodity prices

In line with many studies on the determination of the real exchange rate, the exchange rate series is the IMF's real effective exchange rate based on consumer prices. As in Cashin, Cespedes, and Sahay (2004), commodity prices are expressed in real terms, by deflating the US dollar price of each commodity by the IMF's index (of the unit value) of manufactured exports (MUV)[17]. Real exchange rates $(REER)$ and real commodity prices $(COMP)$ are indices with base January 1995=100.

3.3 Structural factors

Each structural factor is given by a three-category variable. We adopted this three-way classification because it permits to assess more accurately the impact of extreme regimes than a two-way classification. In that respect, increasing the number of categories would not be very useful, and it would complicate the econometric estimation.

Exchange rate regime (EXR). As in Broda (2004), we classify the exchange rate regime in three categories: Fixed, Intermediate, and Floating. Our classification is established using mainly the six-way exchange rate regime classification of Ilzetski, Reinhart, and Rogoff (2008), which is an update of the Reinhart and Rogoff (2004) classification. Fixed regimes include countries with currency pegs and narrow currency bands. Countries with crawling pegs, wide currency bands or managed floats are included in the intermediate category. The floating category includes countries with freely floating exchange rates. The regimes vary across countries and over time. Table 1, columns 5 to 7, report the number of years that each country has spent in every category. Additional details can be found in the Appendix.

Financial openness (KAO). Using the financial openness index of Chinn and Ito (2006) (hereafter ChI), we classify the countries in 3 categories: Closed, Intermediate, and Open. The Closed category includes countries for which the ChI financial openness index is below -1.1. Countries with a financial openness index comprised between -1.1 and 1.0 are included in the Intermediate category, while the Open category includes countries with an index above 1.0. The thresholds used to build our three-way classification are based on the quantile distribution of the Chin-Ito index and follows closely the classification established by Beine, Lodigiani, and Vermeulen (2009). Notice that each country financial openness index is varying over time and Table 1, columns 8 to 10, report the number of years that each country has spent in every category.

Trade openness (TRADE). The trade openness variable is also designed as a three-way dummy variable: Closed, Intermediate, and Open. It is based on the GDP ratio of the sum of the total exports and imports of a country. Using the quartiles, we classified a country as closed if its trade ratio was in the first quartile $(< 42.7\%)$. The Intermediate category includes the countries whose trade ratio is in the second or third quartiles $(42, 7\% < x \leq 88.6\%)$, while a country was classified as open to trade if its trade ratio was in the largest quartile $(> 88.6\%)$. Table 1, columns 11 to 13, report the number of years that each country has spent in every

---

[17]MUV is the unit value index (in US dollars) of manufacturing exports from 20 developed countries with country weights based on the countries' total 1995 exports of manufactures (base 1995=100). The MUV index deflator is taken from the IMF's IFS database.

category.

Export diversification (DIV). We distinguish between three categories of export diversification: High, Intermediate, and Low. To determine each category, we used the data about the export share of the main commodity export (as reported in Table 1) and we divided the cross-country distribution in three quantiles. The High diversification category includes countries for which the share of the main commodity in total exports lies between 20% and 31%. Countries with a share lying between 31% and 50% are included in the Intermediate category while those with a share higher than 50% are considered as weakly diversified (Low category). As the commodity export ratio is computed as an average over the period $1988 - 2008$, the index of export diversification is constant though time and only varies across country units. Ten countries have a High specialization index, twelve countries have an Intermediate specialization index, and eleven countries, most of them being oil producing countries, have a Low specialization index.

Commodity type (TYPE). The twelve different commodities that we have in our data set (see Table 1) are regrouped in three categories: Energy (oil), Metals (cooper, gold and uranium), and Agriculture (banana, coffee, cocoa, cotton, fish, soya, tea, and tobacco). Sixteen countries are the Energy category, five countries are in the Metal category, and twelve countries are in the Agriculture category.

In what follows, for ease of convenience, we use the notations CAT_1, CAT_2, and CAT_3 to identify the three categories of each structural variable. The values of CAT_1, CAT_2, and CAT_3 that correspond to EXR, KAO, $TRADE$, DIV, and $TYPE$ are respectively as follows: $CAT_1 =$ (Fixed, Closed, Closed, High, Energy), $CAT_2 =$ (Intermediate, Intermediate, Intermediate, Intermediate, Metals) and $CAT_3 =$ (Floating, Open, Open, Low, Agriculture).

4 Empirical analysis

Panel econometric techniques are well suited to conduct our empirical investigation .

4.1 Preliminary analysis

Before proceeding to the estimation of the relationship between real exchange rates and commodity prices, a preliminary analysis of the data is required. We start testing whether the real exchange rate and commodity prices series are cross-sectional dependent or not. Recent papers show indeed that the consistency of standard panel estimators as well as the size of basic tests (in particular unit root, cointegration) are affected by cross-sectional dependence. We report in Table 2 Panel A the outcomes of the Pesaran (2004) test, which consists in testing for the presence of cross-sectional dependence versus its absence. It appears that the null hypothesis of cross-sectional independence is strongly rejected by the test. Accordingly, our empirical analysis relies only on panel econometric methods that are robust to cross-sectional dependence.

Secondly, we look at the non stationarity of the real exchange rates and commodity prices

series. Three tests are performed[18]. According to the results reported in Table 2 Panel B, the three tests fail to reject the null of a unit root in the panel data on real exchange rates and commodity prices at usual nominal size , i.e. 5%.

Third, we test whether real exchange rates and commodity prices are cointegrated. To obtain outcomes that are robust to cross-sectional dependence, we use the version of the standard cointegration test of Pedroni (1999) that was developed recently by Fachin (2007). In Table 2 Panel C, we report both mean and median t-tests, with and without time dummies. The evidence is mixed, as the null hypothesis of no cointegration is rejected by the mean t-tests, but not by the median t-tests. According to the results on individual countries reported in Table 1, it seems nevertheless that the presence of a cointegration relationship between real exchange rates and commodity prices cannot be rejected for 17 out of 33 countries. On the basis of this additional evidence, we consider in the rest of our analysis that real exchange rates and commodity prices are panel cointegrated.

The next step in our empirical analysis is to estimate the following cointegration relationship between real exchange rates and commodity prices:

$$REER_{i,t} = a + bCOMP_{i,t} + e_{i,t} \tag{23}$$

where $REER_{i,t}$ is the (log) real exchange rate of country i at time t, and $COMP_{i,t}$ is the (log) real price at time t of the leading commodity exported by country i.

Several techniques have been proposed to estimate such a long run relationship, the most popular being DOLS and FMOLS. Nevertheless Bai, Kao, and Ng (2009) (BKN hereafter) prove that traditional estimators are biased in presence of cross-sectional dependence generated by unobserved global stochastic trends. They introduce common factors to control for cross unit dependence, and thus propose an iterative procedure to extract the common factor and to estimate the equation simultaneously. The results are reported in Table 3 column 1. It turns out that the price of the dominant commodity has a long-run impact on the real exchange rate with an elasticity of 12.5% which is in line with the Bodart, Candelon, and Carpantier (2012)'s analysis, the only one so far to implement the BKN approach in this context.

4.2 Estimates of the impact of structural factors

Once this preliminary analysis achieved, let us now turn to the paper's core, i.e. how the selected structural factors might affect the long-run commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate. To this aim, Equation (23) is augmented by an interaction term between the commodity price variable and the three-way variable representing each structural factor (see Section 3). In practice, we explore the impact of each structural factor by interacting the commodity price variable with two dummy variables, a dummy D_2 (that takes the value 1 when observations are in the 2nd category (CAT_2) and zero otherwise) and a dummy D_3 (that takes the value 1 when observations are in the 3rd category (CAT_3) and zero otherwise). Let us note that we did not include a D_1 dummy to avoid the linear dependence between

---

[18]For a description of the tests, see Bodart, Candelon, and Carpantier (2012)

the interaction terms and the variable $COMP_{i,t}$. The category defined by D_1 will thus be considered as the baseline. This gives the following relationship:

$$REER_{i,t} = a + bCOMP_{i,t} + c_1(D_{j,2,t} * COMP_{i,t}) + c_2(D_{j,3,t} * COMP_{i,t}) + e_{i,t} \qquad (24)$$

The estimation of Equation (24) thus amounts to estimate the long-run relationship between real exchange rates and commodity prices, conditional on each factor. The impact of each factor on the long-run commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate is determined by testing the hypothesis that each c_j $(j = 1, 2)$ is significantly different from zero ($H0$: $cj = 0$).

The estimation outcomes of Equation (24) are reported in Table 3 columns (2) to (6). Before analysing the impact of the structural factors on the real exchange rate-commodity price relationship, let us make two remarks. First, it is noticeable that the baseline coefficient b only varies marginally from one specification to the other, lying between 0.101 and 0.162, highlighting hence the robustness of the elasticity estimate. Second, intermediate category variables always appear as non significant. It thus confirms that splitting the structural factors in 3 regimes is sufficient to apprehend their potential roles, and that the elasticity estimate deviates significantly from the one obtained in the baseline model only when the structural factor takes an "extreme" value, that is a value in the CAT_3 category.

As concerns the effects of the structural factors, outcomes from the regressions confirm our theoretical predictions, i.e. a flexible exchange rate, large trade openness and a high degree of export diversification[19] decreases the elasticity between the real effective exchange rate and the price of the main exported raw commodity. Regarding the impact of the exchange rate regime, our results question the empirical evidences of Chen and Rogoff (2003) and Broda (2004) who, conversely, find that the impact of world commodity prices on the real exchange rate is weaker when the exchange rate is fixed. We also find that when the exported commodity is an agricultural good, the elasticity becomes higher, corroborating our finding that real exchange rate and commodity prices are strongly linked for labor intensive activity sectors. Interestingly, column (3) does not show any effect of financial openness. This result, which does not match the predictions of theoretical models, may be due to the difficulty to measure properly this structural variable. However, to our knowledge, the Chinn and Ito (2006) index remains the most accurate and used measure of financial openness.

4.3   Robustness check

In order to evaluate the robustness of our findings, three investigations are performed. Since the construction of the dummy variables representing the degree of trade openness and the degree of export diversification is obviously ad hoc, we first replicate the analysis of the previous section using an alternative construction of the variables $TRADE$ and DIV[20]. Instead of using quartiles to classify trade values into three categories, we now use quintiles. We then classify a country as Closed if its trade ratio is in the first quintile ($< 38.0\%$) and Open if it is in the largest quintile ($> 94.0\%$) . The Intermediate category includes the countries whose

---

[19]Table 3 row 9 reports that a weak diversification increases significantly the elasticity.

[20]As regards the construction of the variables representing the degree of flexibility of the exchange rate regime and the degree of financial openness, since it is taken from existing studies, we consider that it is less subject to debate

trade ratio is in the second, third and fourth quintiles. The new trade dummy variable is denoted $TRADE^n$. Similarly, the new DIV^n dummy is built upon quartiles. A country is then in the High diversification category if the share of the exports of its main commodity in total exports is in the first quartile ($< 38\%$) while it is in the Low diversification category if the commodity exports share is in the fourth quartile ($> 94.0\%$). When the commodity export ratio lies in the second and third quartiles, the country is classified in the Intermediate diversification category. Results obtained with these new variables are reported in Table 4. It appears that they are qualitatively comparable to those obtained previously (Table 3 columns (4) and (5)).

Since our sample includes several African countries belonging to the CFA Franc Zone (Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Gabon, Mali and Niger), we next investigate whether our results are influenced by the 50 percent devaluation of the CFA Franc that took place in January 1994. We do so by adding in our specification a 1994 dummy which is equal to 1 for CFA countries in 1994 and which is equal to zero otherwise[21]. The new results are reported in Table 5. One can observe that the estimators are very close to those obtained in Table 3, so supporting again the robustness of our conclusions.

Finally, we conduct the analysis by region. We split our sample of countries in two groups, Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. Estimations (1) to (6) are repeated separately for each group and the results are reported in Panels A and B of Table 6. Overall, the results obtained for each group are qualitatively similar to those in the full sample (see Table 3). The real exchange rate is positively related to world commodity prices in both regions, and the relationship is shaped by almost the same structural factors. There are however two noticeable differences. First, the impact of the degree of financial openness is positive and statistically significant for Africa while it is non significant in Latin America and in the full sample. For Africa, this means that the higher is international capital mobility, the higher is the commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate. Second, the results regarding the impact of the commodity type are different between Africa and Latin America and they are also different from the results in the full sample. For Africa, the impact is not significant. A possible explanation of this result is the low diversification of commodity exports as half of the countries in the Sub-Saharan panel have an agricultural commodity as their main commodity export.

5 Conclusions

As it is demonstrated by the literature on the "Dutch" disease, commodity prices are potentially an important determinant of the real exchange rate of countries that produce and export primary commodities. For that reason, the dependence of real exchange rates on commodity prices (or, more generally, on terms of trade) has been the focus of numerous empirical studies. In most of these studies, the empirical evidence consists only of econometric estimates of the real exchange rate response to commodity price shocks. What determines the magnitude of the real exchange rate reaction is however not investigated. This issue is the main subject of this paper. We first showed with a simple theoretical framework that several structural

---

[21]The BKN methodology has a preliminary step where the series are first regressed on a constant and a trend. In order to test the robustness of our results to the 1994 devaluation in CFA countries, we add the 1994 dummy to the regressors in the preliminary regression.

or institutional characteristics may contribute to shape the relationship that exists in the long-run between a country's real exchange rate and the world price of the main commodity that it exports. We emphasized the role of five structural factors: the exchange rate regime, the degree of trade openness, the degree of export diversification, the type of the commodity export, and the degree of financial openness. We then subjected the role of these factors to econometric scrutiny by conducting an empirical investigation involving 33 developing countries specialized in the export of a main primary commodity.

Using panel cointegration methods robust to cross-sectional dependence, we found that four of the five factors, namely the exchange rate regime, the degree of trade openness, the degree of export diversification and the type of the commodity exported, have a significant impact on the long-run commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate. More precisely, we report that the elasticity is reduced when a country operates a floating exchange rate (rather than a fixed exchange rate). It is also smaller when the country is strongly opened to external trade (rather than closed) and when its exports are highly diversified (rather than specialized on a few products). We also find that the elasticity is smaller when the primary commodity is an agricultural good, but is higher when it is oil. Conversely, it appears from our analysis that the degree of financial openness does not influence significantly the extent to which real exchange rates and world commodity prices are related in the long-run.

The analysis by regions show some differences with these main results. The first difference concerns the impact of the commodity type in the determination of the real exchange rate-commodity pricer relationship. For Sub-Saharan African countries, the type of the main exported commodity does not matter and, in Latin America, the elasticity is smaller when the primary commodity is oil and higher when it is metals. Second, it appears that for Africa, the degree of financial openness is a significant determinant of the long-run commodity price elasticity of the real exchange rate.

Our results have several policy implications. They suggest in particular that countries which are concerned by the adverse impact that world commodity price fluctuations may have on their competitiveness, in other words countries that wish to reduce "Dutch disease" effects, should adopt a floating exchange rate instead of a fixed exchange rate. They also suggest that developing countries whose exports are concentrated on a few primary commodities can reduce the dependence of their real exchange rate on world commodity prices by having more diversified exports. According to our results, diversification towards agricultural products would isolate further the real exchange rate from world commodity price shocks. Countries can also protect their competitiveness from fluctuations in world commodity prices by being more opened to external trade. Finally, Sub-Saharan African countries could attenuate the dependence of their real exchange rate on world commodity prices by being less opened to international capital flows.

References

AIZENMAN, J., S. EDWARDS, AND D. RIERA-CRICHTON (2011): "Adjustment patterns to commodity terms of trade shocks: the role of exchange rate and international reserves policies," NBER Working Papers 17692, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

BAI, J., C. KAO, AND S. NG (2009): "Panel cointegration with global stochastic trends," *Journal of Econometrics*, 149(1), 82–99.

BEINE, M., E. LODIGIANI, AND R. VERMEULEN (2009): "Remittances and Financial Openness," CREA Discussion Paper Series 09-09, Center for Research in Economic Analysis, University of Luxembourg.

BODART, V., B. CANDELON, AND J. F. CARPANTIER (2012): "Real exchanges rates in commodity producing countries : a reappraisal," *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 31(16), 1482–1502.

BRAHMBHATT, M., O. CANUTO, AND E. VOSTROKNUTOVA (2010): "Dealing with Dutch Disease," *World Bank - Economic Premise*, (16), 1–7.

BRODA, C. (2004): "Terms of trade and exchange rate regimes in developing countries," *Journal of International Economics*, 63(1), 31–58.

CASHIN, P., L. F. CESPEDES, AND R. SAHAY (2004): "Commodity Currencies and the Real Exchange Rate," *Journal of Development Economics*, 75(1), 239–268.

CHEN, Y.-C., AND K. ROGOFF (2003): "Commodity currencies," *Journal of International Economics*, 60(1), 133–160.

CHINN, M. (2006): "A Primer on Real Effective Exchange Rates: Determinants, Overvaluation, Trade Flows and Competitive Devaluation," *Open Economies Review*, 17(1), 115–143.

CHINN, M. D., AND H. ITO (2006): "What matters for financial development? Capital controls, institutions, and interactions," *Journal of Development Economics*, 81(1), 163–192.

CHOI, I., AND T. K. CHUE (2007): "Subsampling Hypothesis Tests for Nonstationary Panels with Applications to Exchange Rates and Stock Prices," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 22(2), 233–264.

CORDEN, W. M. (1984): "Booming Sector and Dutch Disease Economics: Survey and Consolidation," *Oxford Economic Papers*, 36(3), 359–80.

CORDEN, W. M., AND J. P. NEARY (1982): "Booming Sector and De-Industrialisation in a Small Open Economy," *Economic Journal*, 92(368), 825–48.

COUDERT, V., C. COUHARDE, AND V. MIGNON (2008): "Do Terms of Trade Drive Real Exchange Rates? Comparing Oil and Commodity Currencies," Working Papers 2008-32, CEPII research center.

DAI, C. Y., AND W. M. CHIA (2008): "Terms of trade shocks and exchange rate regimes in East Asian countries," in *4th Asia-Pacific Economic Association Conference at Beijing, China*.

DAVIDSON, R., AND J. G. MACKINNON (2006): "Improving the Reliability of Bootstrap Tests with the Fast Double Bootstrap," Working Papers 1044, Queen's University, Department of Economics.

DESRUELLE, D., AND A. ZANELLO (1997): "A Primer on the IMF's Information Notice System," IMF Working Papers 97/71, International Monetary Fund.

DORNBUSCH, R. (1980): *Open Economy Macroeconomics*. New-York: Basic Books.

EASTERLY, W., AND A. RESHEF (2010): "African Export Successes: Surprises, Stylized Facts, and Explanations," NBER Working Papers 16597, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

EDWARDS, S. (1989): "The Liberalization of the Current Capital Accounts and the Real ExchangeRate," NBER Working Papers 2162, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

——— (2011): "Exchange Rates in Emerging Countries: Eleven Empirical Regularities from Latin America and East Asia," NBER Working Papers 17074, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

EDWARDS, S., AND E. L. YEYATI (2003): "Flexible Exchange Rates as Shock Absorbers," NBER Working Papers 9867, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

FACHIN, S. (2007): "Long-Run Trends in Internal Migrations in Italy: a Study in Panel Cointegration with Dependent Units," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 22(2), 401–428.

FRANKEL, J. (2003): "A Proposed Monetary Regime for Small Commodity Exporters: Peg the Export Price ('PEP')," *International Finance*, 6(1), 61–88.

FRANKEL, J. A. (2010): "The Natural Resource Curse: A Survey," NBER Working Papers 15836, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

GREGORIO, J. D., AND H. C. WOLF (1994): "Terms of Trade, Productivity, and the Real Exchange Rate," NBER Working Papers 4807, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

ILZETSKI, E., C. M. REINHART, AND K. S. ROGOFF (2008): "Exchange Rate Arrangements Entering the 21st Century: Which Anchor Will Hold?," .

LEVY-YEYATI, E., AND F. STURZENEGGER (2005): "Classifying exchange rate regimes: Deeds vs. words," *European Economic Review*, 49(6), 1603–1635.

OBSTFELD, M., AND K. S. ROGOFF (1996): *Foundations of International Macroeconomics*. MIT.

PEDRONI, P. (1999): "Critical Values for Cointegration Tests in Heterogeneous Panels with Multiple Regressors," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 61, 653–70.

PESARAN, M. (2004): "General Diagnostic Tests for Cross Section Dependence in Panels," Cambridge Working Papers in Economics 0435, Faculty of Economics, University of Cambridge.

Reinhart, C. M., and K. S. Rogoff (2004): "The Modern History of Exchange Rate Arrangements: A Reinterpretation," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(1), 1–48.

Appendix: description of the data

To proceed to the selection of the countries included in our dataset, we recovered from the UN Comtrade database the annual US$ export value of 42 commodities for 65 countries over the period 1988-2007. The initial set of 65 countries corresponds to the sample of developing and emerging countries selected by Cashin, Cespedes, and Sahay (2004) on the basis of the International Monetary Fund classification of developing countries according to the composition of their export earnings, to which we added oil producing countries. For each country, we computed the 1988-2007 annual average of the US$ export receipt of each individual commodity and we expressed the resulting value as a share of the total US$ export receipts of the country. We then kept the countries for which at least one commodity had a share in total exports of at least 20 percent. From the resulting list of countries, we removed Mozambique because the export share of its aluminium exports was more than 50% after 2001 but about zero before 2000. A few other countries were excluded from our analysis because of the unavailability of data for all the variables of our model.

Real exchange rates are IMF real effective exchange rates based on consumer prices[22]. The data are extracted from the IMF's Information Notice System (INS) database.

Commodity prices are taken from the International Financial Statistics (IFS) database of the IMF. Two series, Tobacco and Gold, were not available in IFS and were taken from Datastream (with respective codes: USI76M.ZA and GOLDBLN). Details about each series are provided in Table 7.

Data on exchange rate regimes are taken from two databases. The first database, IRR, is provided by Ilzetski, Reinhart, and Rogoff (2008) and is an update of the Reinhart and Rogoff (2004) exchange rate regime classification. The IRR exchange rate regime classification is a de facto classification based on market-determined exchange rates. It provides monthly and annual classification data over the period 1940-2007. Classification by 6 and 15 categories are available. The second database, LYS, was established by Levy-Yeyati and Sturzenegger (2005) on the basis of data on nominal exchange rates volatility and international reserves volatility (de facto classification). It covers 183 countries for the period 1974-2004. Classification by 3 and 5 categories are available. Both databases have advantages and weaknesses. One advantage of the LYS database is to provide a 3-category classification, but it has no data for 2005 and later. On the contrary, the IRR database covers the period 1980-2007, but it has only 6- and 15-category classifications. Our paper uses mainly the IRR 6-regime classification to benefit from the longest time coverage (1980-2007). It contains however missing values. When possible, we solved this problem by replacing the missing value by the value found in the LYS 3-category classification. When no data were available in the LYS database, we replaced the missing value by the value of the previous year. We converted the IRR 6-regime classification into 3 exchange rate regime categories as follows: our Fixed Regime category corresponds to IRR category 1; our Intermediate Regime category corresponds to categories 2 and 3 of IRR; and our Flexible Regime category includes categories 4, 5 and 6 of IRR.

The financial openness dummy variable used in our analysis is based upon the financial open-

---

[22]See Desruelle and Zanello (1997) for details regarding the construction of the real effective exchange rates.

ness index of Chinn and Ito (2006). The Chinn-Ito index measures the degree of openness of a country's capital account. It is based on binary dummy variables that codify the tabulation of restrictions on cross-border financial transactions reported in the International Monetary Fund's *Annual Report on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Restrictions*. This index is thus a de jure measure of financial openness. The index is not smoothly distributed. Values range between -1.9 and 2.6, with about one third of the observations having a value of -1.13. Three values were missing in the Chinn-Ito database: Dominica in 1980 and 1981 and Sudan in 2006. We filled the gaps by setting the 1980 and 1981 Dominica indices equal to the 1982 Dominica index, and by setting the 2006 Sudan index equal to the 2005 Sudan index (which is the same as the 2007 index).

GDP, export and import data used to construct the trade openness dummy variable are all taken from the World Bank. All the data are in current US$.

Table 1: Data summary

	Comdty	Country	β coint	Currency Reg			Fin Opnss			Trade Opnss			Div		Cdty Type
				1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	Wght	Cat	
1	Oil	Algeria	0.39	0	27	1	28	0	0	3	25	0	46.4	2	Energy
2	Oil	Bahrain	0.09	28	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	28	23.2	1	Energy
3	Coffee	Burundi	0.65***	4	23	1	28	0	0	24	4	0	54.5	3	Agri
4	Oil	Cameroon	0.03	28	0	0	18	10	0	14	14	0	40.7	2	Energy
5	Copper	Chile	0.07	2	25	1	18	3	7	1	27	0	29.7	1	Metal
6	Oil	Colombia	0.15	0	28	0	24	4	0	28	0	0	20.6	1	Energy
7	Cocoa	Cote d'Iv.	-0.13	28	0	0	18	10	0	0	26	2	34.5	2	Agri
8	Bananas	Dominica	-0.17***	28	0	0	8	20	0	0	0	28	27.8	1	Agri
9	Oil	Ecuador	0.20	10	7	11	0	24	4	0	28	0	38.6	2	Energy
10	Coffee	Ethiopia	0.00	10	18	0	28	0	0	24	4	0	47.4	2	Agri
11	Oil	Gabon	0.13*	28	0	0	12	16	0	0	9	19	74.3	3	Energy
12	Cocoa	Ghana	10.39***	0	13	15	26	2	0	8	12	8	33.7	2	Agri
13	Coffee	Honduras	0.78	5	22	1	9	19	0	0	14	14	23.5	1	Agri
14	Oil	Iran	1.59***	0	26	2	20	8	0	18	10	0	79.7	3	Energy
15	Tea	Kenya	2.95***	7	19	2	16	0	12	0	28	0	21.4	1	Agri
16	Oil	Kuwait	0.08**	5	23	0	0	0	28	0	6	22	58.7	3	Energy
17	Tobacco	Malawi	0.72***	3	12	13	27	1	0	0	26	2	58.5	3	Agri
18	Gold	Mali	1.14***	28	0	0	12	16	0	0	28	0	52.3	3	Metal
19	Fish	Mauritania	0.52**	0	28	0	27	1	0	0	9	19	33.8	2	Agri
20	Uranium	Niger	0.20***	28	0	0	12	16	0	13	15	0	40.5	2	Metal
21	Oil	Nigeria	0.48	0	18	10	15	13	0	5	22	1	95.5	3	Energy
22	Cotton	Pakistan	1.22**	2	26	0	28	0	0	28	0	0	21.1	1	Agri
23	Oil	Papua N. G.	0.06***	10	18	0	9	19	0	0	0	28	22.9	1	Energy
24	Soya	Paraguay	0.99***	0	25	3	10	9	9	4	13	11	32.7	2	Agri
25	Oil	Qatar	0.13***	28	0	0	0	0	28	0	20	8	46.1	2	Energy
26	Oil	Saudi Ar.	0.16	28	0	0	0	0	28	0	23	5	74.9	3	Energy
27	Oil	Sudan	-0.05	8	20	0	19	9	0	25	3	0	25.4	1	Energy
28	Oil	Syria	0.38*	0	28	0	28	0	0	5	23	0	54.4	3	Energy
29	Gold	Tanzania	1.87	0	25	3	25	3	0	4	24	0	22.5	1	Metal
30	Oil	UAE	0.05	27	1	0	0	0	28	0	1	27	37.8	2	Energy
31	Coffee	Uganda	0.22	3	16	9	14	4	10	25	3	0	40.7	2	Agri
32	Oil	Venezuela	0.21	3	13	12	5	15	8	2	26	0	64.4	3	Energy
33	Copper	Zambia	0.68***	1	4	23	16	0	12	0	28	0	59.7	3	Metal
Mean			0.79										43.6		
Med.			0.21										40.5		
All				352	465	107	500	222	202	231	471	222			

Notes. Beta cointegration coefficients are computed by FMOLS in a univariate setting on annual data. *, ** and *** hold for significance at 10%, 5% and 1%. Currency regime is a de facto classification into 3 categories from 1 (fix) to 3 (flexible). Since a country currency regime can change over time, figures correspond to the number of years in each regime. Financial openness, based on Kaopen index, is classified into 3 categories from 1 (closed) to 3 (open). Since financial openness can change over time, figures correspond to the number of years in each regime. Trade openness is computed by dividing the sum of exports and imports on GDP. Trade openness is classified into 3 categories from 1 (closed) to 3 (open). Since a country can change of category over time, figures correspond to the number of years in each category. The degree of diversification, proxied by the weight (in %) of the dominant commodity in the exports, is classified into 3 categories from 1 (high diversificafion) to 3 (low diversification). The weight average of the dominant commodity is by definition not changing over time. Commodity type refers to the nature of the commodity, from labor low intensive (energy) to labor high intensive (agricultural).

Table 2: Cross-sectional dependence, panel unit root and panel cointegration tests

A- Cross-sectional dependence test				
	test value	p-value	Dependence?	
	45.039	0.00000	Yes	

B- Panel unit root tests				
UR	test value	block rule	crit val (5%)	crit val (10%)
Real exchange rates				
LLC	-12.58	SC	-15.39	-14.27
		MV	-15.78	-14.53
IPS	-2.102	SC	-2.434	-2.409
		MV	-2.50	-2.37
INVN	-0.2043	SC	-2.687	-2.451
		MV	-4.63	-3.29
Commodity prices				
LLC	-9.175	SC	-15.23	-14.66
		MV	-16.27	-13.52
IPS	-1.760	SC	-2.597	-2.461
		MV	-2.58	-2.43
INVN	4.466	SC	-3.18	-3.01
		MV	-6.11	-3.94

C- Panel cointegration tests				
	test value		p-values	
		basic bootstrap	FDB1	FDB2
With common time dummies				
Mean CADF	-3.13	2.00	1.00	2.00
Median CADF	-2.80	22.00	20.00	19.00
Without common time dummies				
Mean CADF	-3.01	4.00	4.00	5.00
Median CADF	-2.84	20.00	17.00	18.00

Notes. The cross-sectional dependence test follows Pesaran (2004). The Pesaran test is based on fixed effects models. The null of the Pesaran test is the absence of cross sectional dependence. The panel unit root tests follow the sub-sampling based approach of Choi and Chue (2007). Real exchange rates and commodity prices are in logarithms. An intercept and a trend have been considered in all the experiments. "SC" and "MV" hold for Stochastic Calibration and Minimum Volatility, respectively, two alternative block selection rules. The minimum and maximum block sizes for the MV rule are 0.4 and 0.6, respectively. An asterisk indicates the rejection of the null of panel unit root (no rejection in our results). The panel cointegration tests are Fachin (2007)'s versions of Pedroni (1999)'s tests. Real exchange rates and commodity prices are in logarithms. An intercept and a trend have been considered in all the tests. Block size selection for the cointegration test is based on 0.1T. "FDB1" and "FDB2" hold for Fast Double Bootstraps of types 1 and 2 (see Davidson and MacKinnon (2006)). P-values are in percent.

Table 3: Estimation results

coef.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
b	0.125***	0.137***	0.129***	0.139***	0.101**	0.162***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.041)	(0.027)
$c_{EXR,2}$		-0.008				
		(0.007)				
$c_{EXR,3}$		-0.044***				
		(0.009)				
$c_{KAO,2}$			-0.005			
			(0.005)			
$c_{KAO,3}$			0.001			
			(0.010)			
$c_{TRADE,2}$				-0.008		
				(0.006)		
$c_{TRADE,3}$				-0.019**		
				(0.009)		
$c_{DIV,2}$					-0.006	
					(0.054)	
$c_{DIV,3}$					0.132**	
					(0.055)	
$c_{TYPE,2}$						0.028
						(0.057)
$c_{TYPE,3}$						-0.100*
						(0.056)

Notes. Column (1) reports the results of Equation 23 where real exchange rates are regressed on commodity prices, and where b is the elasticity. Columns (2)-(6) report the estimates of Equation 24 for the different factors added in the specification. The factors are respectively the exchange rate regime (EXR), the financial openness (KAO), the trade openness (TRADE), the export diversification (DIV) and the commodity type (TYPE). The subscripts 2 and 3 in the label of the factors refer to the three-way classification, where 2 stands for intermediate, intermediate, intermediate, intermediate and metals, respectively for EXR, KAO, TRADE, DIV and TYPE, and where 3 stands for floating, open, open, low and agriculture, respectively for EXR, KAO, TRADE, DIV and TYPE. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, ** and *** stand for significance at 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively.

Table 4: Robustness check: modification of the trade openness and export diversification dummies

	b	$c_{i,2}$	$c_{i,3}$
$i = TRADE^n$	0.161*** (0.023)	-0.013** (0.006)	-0.023** (0.009)
$i = DIV^n$	0.125*** (0.045)	0.004 (0.054)	0.134** (0.060)

Notes. Standard errors in parentheses. *, ** and *** stand for significance at 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively.

Table 5: Robustness check: accounting for the January 1994 devaluation of the CFA Franc

coef.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
b	0.141***	0.130***	0.110***	0.149***	0.114***	0.154***
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.041)	(0.027)
$c_{EXR,2}$		-0.006				
		(0.007)				
$c_{EXR,3}$		-0.043 ***				
		(0.009)				
$c_{KAO,2}$			0.003			
			(0.005)			
$c_{KAO,3}$			0.012			
			(0.010)			
$c_{TRADE,2}$				-0.009		
				(0.006)		
$c_{TRADE,3}$				-0.018 **		
				(0.009)		
$c_{DIV,2}$					-0.028	
					(0.054)	
$c_{DIV,3}$					0.083	
					(0.055)	
$c_{TYPE,2}$						0.025
						(0.057)
$c_{TYPE,3}$						-0.097*
						(0.056)

Notes. Column (1) reports the results of Equation 23 where real exchange rates are regressed on commodity prices, and where b is the elasticity. Columns (2)-(6) report the estimates of Equation 24 for the different factors added in the specification. The factors are respectively the exchange rate regime (EXR), the financial openness (KAO), the trade openness (TRADE), the export diversification (DIV) and the commodity type (TYPE). The subscripts 2 and 3 in the label of the factors refer to the three-way classification, where 2 stands for intermediate, intermediate, intermediate, intermediate and metals, respectively for EXR, KAO, TRADE, DIV and TYPE, and where 3 stands for floating, open, open, low and agriculture, respectively for EXR, KAO, TRADE, DIV and TYPE. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, ** and *** stand for significance at 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively.

Table 6: Robustness check: Estimations by region

	A - Sub-Saharan African countries					
coef.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
b	0.210***	0.151***	0.163***	0.155***	0.039	0.157***
	(0.036)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.030)	(0.046)	(0.037)
$c_{EXR,2}$		0.003				
		(0.010)				
$c_{EXR,3}$		-0.068***				
		(0.012)				
$c_{KAO,2}$			0.010*			
			(0.006)			
$c_{KAO,3}$			0.040***			
			(0.012)			
$c_{TRADE,2}$				0.004		
				(0.008)		
$c_{TRADE,3}$				-0.030**		
				(0.012)		
$c_{DIV,2}$					0.030	
					(0.079)	
$c_{DIV,3}$					0.221***	
					(0.061)	
$c_{TYPE,2}$						-0.046
						(0.082)
$c_{TYPE,3}$						0.016
						(0.064)
	B - Latin American countries					
coef.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
b	0.089***	0.120***	0.102***	0.224***	-	0.122***
	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.034)	(0.031)	-	(0.034)
$c_{EXR,2}$		-0.006				
		(0.012)				
$c_{EXR,3}$		-0.029**				
		(0.013)				
$c_{KAO,2}$			0.006			
			(0.008)			
$c_{KAO,3}$			0.013			
			(0.014)			
$c_{TRADE,2}$				-0.063***		
				(0.008)		
$c_{TRADE,3}$				-0.058***		
				(0.012)		
$c_{DIV,2}$					-	
					-	
$c_{DIV,3}$					-	
					-	
$c_{TYPE,2}$						0.211**
						(0.088)
$c_{TYPE,3}$						0.145
						(0.104)

Notes. Countries included in Panel A are Burundi, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. Countries included in Panel B are Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Ecuador, Honduras, Paraguay and Venezuela. Column (1) reports the results of Equation 23 where real exchange rates are regressed on commodity prices, and where b is the elasticity. Columns (2)-(6) report the estimates of Equation 24 for the different factors added in the specification. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, ** and *** stand for significance at 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively.

Table 7: Description of the commodity price series

Commodity	Source	Description
Bananas	IFS	Central American and Ecuador, first class quality tropical pack, Chiquita, Dole and Del Monte, U.S. importer's price FOB U.S. ports (Sopisco News, Guayaquil). $/Mt
Cocoa beans	IFS	International Cocoa Organization cash price. Average of the three nearest active futures trading months in the New York Cocoa Exchange at noon and the London Terminal market at closing time, CIF U.S. and European ports (The Financial Times, London). $/Mt
Coffee	IFS	International Coffee Organization, Other Mild Arabicas New York cash price. Average of El Salvador central standard, Guatemala prime washed and Mexico prime washed, prompt shipment, ex-dock New York. Cts/lb
Copper	IFS	London Metal Exchange, grade A cathodes, spot price, CIF European ports (Wall Street Journal, New York and Metals Week, New York). Prior to July 1986, higher grade, wirebars, or cathodes. $/Mt
Cotton	IFS	Cotton, Liverpool Index A, cif Liverpool US cent/pound
Fish	IFS	Fresh Norwegian Salmon, farm bred, export price (NorStat). US$/kg
Gold	DS	Gold Bullion LBM US$/Troy Ounce
Oil	IFS	U.S., West Texas Intermediate 40o API, spot price, FOB Midland Texas (New York Mercantile Exchange, New York). (In 1983-1984 Platt's Oilgram Price Report, New York). $/bbl
Soya	IFS	Soybean U.S., cif Rotterdam US$ per Metric Ton
Tea	IFS	Mombasa auction price for best PF1, Kenyan Tea. Replaces London auction price beginning July 1998. Cts/Kg
Tobacco	DS	Tobacco, US (all markets), mid month curn
Uranium	IFS	Metal Bulletin Nuexco Exchange Uranium (U3O8 restricted) price. $/lb

Notes. "IFS" refers to International Financial Statistics from the IMF. "DS" refers to Datastream. "LME" refers to London Metal Exchange. "bbl" refers to barrel (42 US Gallons). "API" refers to American Petroleum Institute.