

Cheung, Yin-Wong; Chinn, Menzie; Fujii, Eiji

Working Paper

China's current account and exchange rate

Working Paper, No. 07-13

Provided in Cooperation with:

University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz Institute for International Economics (SCIE)

Suggested Citation: Cheung, Yin-Wong; Chinn, Menzie; Fujii, Eiji (2007) : China's current account and exchange rate, Working Paper, No. 07-13, University of California, Santa Cruz Institute for International Economics (SCIE), Santa Cruz, CA

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/64080>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

China's Current Account and Exchange Rate

Yin-Wong Cheung*
University of California, Santa Cruz and University of Hong Kong

Menzie D. Chinn**
University of Wisconsin, Madison and NBER

Eiji Fujii†
University of Tsukuba

August 27, 2007

Abstract: We examine whether the Chinese exchange rate is misaligned and how Chinese trade flows respond to the exchange rate and to economic activity. We find, first, that the currency (CNY) is substantially below the value predicted by their cross-country estimates. The economic magnitude of the mis-alignment is substantial -- on the order of 50 percent in log terms. However, the misalignment is typically not statistically significant, in the sense of being more than two standard errors away from the conditional mean. Second, we find that Chinese multilateral trade flows respond to relative prices -- as represented by a trade weighted exchange rate -- but the relationship is not always precisely estimated. In addition, the direction of the effects is sometimes different from what is expected a priori. For instance, Chinese ordinary imports actually rise in response to a yuan depreciation; however, Chinese exports appear to respond to yuan depreciation in the expected manner, as long as a supply variable is included. In that sense, Chinese trade is not exceptional. Furthermore, Chinese trade with the United States appears to behave in a standard manner -- especially after the expansion in the Chinese manufacturing capital stock is accounted for. Thus, the China-US trade balance should respond to real exchange rate and relative income movements in the anticipated manner. However, in neither the case of multilateral nor bilateral trade flows should one expect quantitatively large effects arising from exchange rate changes. And, of course, these results are not informative with regard to the question of how a change in the CNY/USD exchange rate would affect the overall US trade deficit. Finally, we stress the fact that considerable uncertainty surrounds both our estimates of CNY misalignment and the responsiveness of trade flows to movements in exchange rates and output levels. In particular, the results for trade elasticities are sensitive to econometric specification, accounting for supply effects, and for the inclusion of time trends.

Acknowledgments: Paper prepared for NBER conference on "China's Growing Role in World Trade," organized by Rob Feenstra and Shang-Jin Wei, in Cape Cod, MA, August 3-4, 2007. We thank the discussant Jeffrey Frankel, Shang-Jin Wei, Arthur Kroeber, Xiangming Li and Jaime Marquez and conference participants for comments and discussion, and Guillaume Gaulier, Chang-Tai Hsieh and Hiro Ito for providing data. Cheung acknowledges the hospitality of the Hong Kong Institute for Monetary Research, where part of this research was conducted. Faculty research funds of the University of California, Santa Cruz, and the University of Wisconsin are gratefully acknowledged.

* Department of Economics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064. Tel/Fax: +1 (831) 459-4247/5900. Email: cheung@ucsc.edu

** **Corresponding Author:** Robert M. LaFollette School of Public Affairs, and Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, 1180 Observatory Drive, Madison, WI 53706-1393. Tel/Fax: +1 (608) 262-7397/2033. Email: mchinn@lafollette.wisc.edu

† Graduate School of Systems and Information Engineering, University of Tsukuba, Tennodai 1-1-1, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan. Tel/Fax: +81 29 853 5176. E-mail: efujii@sk.tsukuba.ac.jp

1. Introduction

China – and Chinese economic policy – has loomed large on the global economic stage in recent years. Yet, even as arguments over the normalcy of the Chinese trade balance and the value of the Chinese currency continue, there is substantial debate in both academic and policy circles surrounding what are the determinants of these variables.

Interestingly, there are very few studies that simultaneously assess the Chinese exchange rate and trade/current account balance. This is partly an outcome of the peculiar characteristics of the Chinese economy. In this study, we attempt to inform the debate over the interactions between the exchange rate and the current account by recourse to two key methodologies. First we identify the equilibrium real exchange rate from the standpoint of cross-country studies. Second, we attempt to obtain more precise estimates of Chinese trade elasticities, both on a multilateral and bilateral (with the US) basis. In doing so, we hope to transcend the current limited debate based upon rules-of-thumb.

To anticipate our results, we obtain several interesting results. First, the CNY is substantially below the value predicted by our cross-country estimates. The economic magnitude of the mis-alignment is substantial – on the order of 50% in log terms. However, we also find that the misalignment is typically not statistically significant, in the sense of being more than one standard error away from the conditional mean.

Second, we find that Chinese multilateral trade flows do respond to relative prices – as represented by a trade weighted exchange rate – but that that relationship is not always precisely estimated. In addition, the direction of effects is different than expected a priori. For instance, we find that Chinese ordinary imports rise in response to a yuan depreciation. However, Chinese

exports do appear to respond to yuan depreciation in the expected manner, as long as a supply variable is included. So, in this sense, Chinese trade is not exceptional.

Furthermore Chinese trade with the US appears to behave in a standard manner – especially after the expansion in the Chinese manufacturing capital stock is accounted for. Thus, the China-US trade balance should respond to real exchange rate and relative income movements in the anticipated manner. However, in neither the case of multilateral nor bilateral trade flows should one expect quantitatively large effects arising from exchange rate changes. And of course, our results are not informative with regard to the question of how a change in the CNY/USD exchange rate would affect the overall US trade deficit.

Finally, we highlight the fact that considerable uncertainty surrounds both our estimates of CNY misalignment and the responsiveness of trade flows to movements in exchange rates and output levels. In particular, our results for trade elasticities are sensitive to econometric specification, accounting for supply effects, and the inclusion of time trends.

2. Placing Matters in Perspective

A discussion of the Chinese economy, and its interaction with the global economy, is necessarily complicated, in large part because of its recent – and incomplete – transition from a central command economy to a market economy.¹

Take for instance the proper measure of the exchange rate in both nominal and real terms, the central relative prices in any open macroeconomy. Figure 1 depicts the official bilateral value of the Chinese currency over the last twenty years. Taking the standard approach in the crisis early warning system literature, one can calculate the extent of exchange rate overvaluation as a

¹ See Cheung, Chinn and Fujii (2007a) for discussion of various issues related to the transformation of the Chinese economy.

deviation from a trend. Adopting this approach in the case of China would not lead to a very satisfactory result. Consider first what a simple examination of the bilateral real exchange rate between the US and the CNY implies. In Figure 1, the rate is expressed so higher values constitute a weaker Chinese currency. Over the entire sample period, the CNY has experienced a downward trend in value.

However, as with the case with economies experience transitions from controlled to partially decontrolled capital accounts and from dual to unified exchange rate regimes, there is some dispute over what exchange rate measure to use. In the Chinese case, an argument can be made that, with a portion of transactions taking place at swap rates, the 1994 “mega-devaluation” was actually better described as a unification of different rates of exchange. Figure 2 shows the official rate (the solid line) at which some transactions took place, and a floating rate -- often called the “swap-market rate” -- shown with the thick dashed line. Using a transactions-weighted average of these two rates (called the “adjusted rate” yields a substantially different profile for the yuan’s path, with a substantially different (essentially flat) trend, as depicted in Figure 3.²

The trade-weighted exchange rate is arguably more relevant. Figure 4 depicts the IMF’s effective exchange rate index (logged), and a linear trend estimated over the available sample of 1986-2007M02. Following the methodology outlined in Chinn (2000a), Cheung *et al.* (forthcoming) test for cointegration of the nominal (trade weighted) exchange rate and the relative price level. We find that there is evidence for cointegration of these two variables, with the posited coefficients. This means that we can use this trend line as a statistically valid indication of the mean value which the real exchange rate series reverts to. Interestingly, repeating this procedure for the more recent period yields a 5.5% *overvaluation* in 2007M02.

² See Fernald, Edison and Loungani (1999) for a discussion, in the context of whether the 1994 “devaluation” caused the 1997-98 currency crises.

It is obviously an understatement to say that the Chinese current and trade accounts have elicited substantial interest in policy and academic circles over the past few years, in part because of the apparent break in the behavior of these flows. Figure 5 shows the current account balance expressed in dollar terms and as a share of GDP. Clearly, the Chinese current account balance has ballooned in recent years, sparking the debate over the “normalcy” and propriety of a large emerging market running such a large surplus. Of course, normalcy is in the eye of the beholder. Chinn and Ito (2007) argue that China’s current account surplus over the 2000-04 period – while exceeding the predicted value – was within the statistical margin of error, according to a model of the current account based upon the determinants of saving and investment.³

The current account balance is driven largely by the trade balance.⁴ Figure 6 shows the trade balance in dollar terms. Until about 2004, the Chinese trade account was in rough balance, with deficits against other countries offsetting a trade surplus with the United States.

This brings us to one interesting aspect of the Chinese experience – the fact that such a large portion of the Chinese surplus is accounted for by the United States. Figure 6 also shows the bilateral surplus with the United States, highlighting the fact that the behavior of overall Chinese trade balances differs substantially from that of the China-US trade balance.⁵ This divergence reflects in part China’s role in the global supply chain.

³ Chinn and Ito’s analysis is based upon the Chinn and Prasad (2003) approach to estimating the “normal” level of a current account balance, using as fundamentals the budget balance, per capita income, demographic variables, and various other control variables.

⁴ Although the gap has increased in recent years, with the current account exceeding the trade balance as income on China’s increasing foreign exchange reserves offsets income payments to a greater and greater extent.

⁵ Note in this figure, we have used the Chinese measure of the China-US trade balance, which differs from the US measure, due to both differences in valuation measures and treatment of re-exports via Hong Kong.

It is because of this disjuncture between some of the measures of equilibrium exchange rates and the behavior of the external accounts that we adopt the procedure of examining first a model of the equilibrium exchange rate, and then – taking the exchange rate as largely exogenous – estimating the responsiveness of trade flows to the various macroeconomic variables in a partial equilibrium framework.

3. The Chinese equilibrium exchange rate

3.1 An overview of approaches

Several surveys have compared the estimates of the degree to which the CNY is misaligned. GAO (2005) provides a comparison of the academic and policy literature, while Cairns (2005b) briefly surveys recent point estimates obtained by different analysts. Here, we review the literature to focus primarily on the economic and econometric distinctions associated with the various analyses. We also restrict our attention to those studies conducted in recent years.

Many of these papers fall into familiar categories, either relying upon some form of relative purchasing power parity (PPP) or cost competitiveness calculation, the modeling of deviations from absolute PPP, a composite model incorporating several channels of effects (sometimes called behavioral equilibrium exchange rate models), or flow equilibrium models. Table 1 provides a typology of these approaches, further disaggregated by the data dimension (cross section, time series or both).

The relative PPP comparisons are the easiest to make, in terms of calculations. However, relative PPP in levels requires the cointegration of the relevant price indices with the nominal exchange rate (or, equivalently, the stationarity of the real exchange rate), but these conditions

do not necessarily hold, and are seldom tested for. Wang (2004) reports some IMF estimates of unit labor cost deflated CNY. This series has appreciated in real terms since 1997; of course, this comparison, like all other comparisons based upon indices, depends upon selecting a year that is deemed to represent equilibrium. Selecting a year before 1992 would imply that the CNY has depreciated over time.

Bosworth (2004), Frankel (2006), Coudert and Couharde (2005), and Cairns (2005b) estimate the relationship between the deviation from absolute PPP and relative per capita income. All obtain similar results regarding the relationship between the two variables, although Coudert and Couharde fail to detect this link for the CNY.

Wang (2004) and Funke and Rahn (2007) implement what could broadly be described as behavioral equilibrium exchange rate (BEER) specifications. These models incorporate a variety of channels through which the real exchange rate is affected. Since each author selects different variables to include, the implied misalignments will necessarily vary, as discussed in Dunaway *et al.* (2006), as well as McCown *et al.* (2007).

A different set of approaches eschews the price-based approaches, and views the current account as the residual of savings and investment behavior. The equilibrium exchange rate is derived from the implied medium term current account using import and export elasticities. In the IMF's "macroeconomic approach", the norms are estimated. Coudert and Couharde (2005) implement a closely related approach for China.

A final set of approaches, popular in the policy arena, focuses on the persistent components of the balance of payments (Goldstein, 2004; Bosworth, 2004). This last set of approaches – what we will term the external accounts approach – is perhaps most useful for conducting short-term analyses. But the wide dispersion in implied misalignments reflects the

difficulties in making judgments about what constitutes *persistent* capital flows. For instance, Prasad and Wei (2005), examining the composition of capital inflows into and out of China, argue that much of the reserve accumulation that has occurred in the period before the current account surge was due to speculative inflow; hence, the degree of misalignment was small. That assessment has been viewed as less applicable as the current account balance has surged in the past two years.⁶

Two observations regarding these various estimates are of interest. First, as noted by Cairns (2005a), there is an interesting relationship between the particular approach adopted by a study and the degree of misalignment found. Analyses implementing relative PPP and related approaches indicate the least misalignment. Those adopting approaches focusing on the external accounts yield estimates that are in the intermediate range. Finally, studies implementing an absolute PPP methodology result in the greatest degree of estimated undervaluation.

Given that the last approach is the most straightforward in terms of implementation, we adopt it, cognizant of the tendency of this approach to maximize the estimated extent of misalignment.

3.2 A Framework

The key problem with explaining the Chinese exchange rate and current account imbalance is that China deviates substantially from cross-country norms for at least its currency value.

Following Cheung *et al.* (2007b), we exploit a well-known relationship between deviations from absolute purchasing power parity and real *per capita* income using panel regression methods. By placing the CNY in the context of this well-known empirical

⁶ In addition, such flow-based measures must be conditioned on the existence of capital controls, the durability and effectiveness of which must necessarily be a matter of judgment.

relationship exhibited by a large number of developing and developed countries, over a long time horizon, this approach addresses the question of where China's real exchange rate stands relative to the "equilibrium" level. In addition to calculating the numerical magnitude of the degree of misalignment, we assess the estimates in the context of statistical uncertainty. In this respect, we extend the standard practice of considering both economic and statistical significance in coefficient estimates to the prediction aspect.

The "price level" variable in the Penn World Tables (Summers and Heston, 1991), and other purchasing power parity exchange rates, attempt to circumvent measurement problems arising from heterogeneity in goods baskets across countries by using *prices* (not price indices) of goods, and calculating the aggregate price level using the same weights. Assume for the moment that this can be accomplished, but that some share of the basket (α) is nontradable (denoted by N subscript), and the remainder is tradable (denoted by T subscript). Then:

$$p_t = \alpha p_{N,t} + (1 - \alpha) p_{T,t} \quad (1)$$

By simple manipulation, one finds that the "real exchange rate" is given by:

$$q_t \equiv s_t - p_t + p_t^* = (s_t - p_{T,t} + p_{T,t}^*) - \alpha [p_{N,t} - p_{T,t}] + \alpha [p_{N,t}^* - p_{T,t}^*] \quad (2)$$

Rewriting, and indicating the first term in (parentheses), the intercountry price of tradables, as $q_{T,t}$ and the intercountry relative price of nontradables as $\omega_t \equiv [p_{N,t} - p_{T,t}] - [p_{N,t}^* - p_{T,t}^*]$, leads to the following rewriting of (2):

$$q_t = q_{T,t} - \alpha \omega_t \quad (2')$$

This expression indicates that the real exchange rate can appreciate as changes occur in the relative price of traded goods between countries, or as the relative price of nontradables rises in one country, *relative to another*. In principle, economic factors can affect one or both.

Models that center on the relative price of nontradables include the well-known approaches of Balassa (1964) and Samuelson (1964). In those instances, the relative price of nontradables depends upon sectoral productivity differentials, as in Hsieh (1982), Canzoneri, Cumby and Diba (1999), and Chinn (2000b.). They also include those approaches that include demand side determinants of the relative price, such as that of DeGregorio and Wolf (1994), who observe that if consumption preferences are not homothetic and factors are not perfectly free to move intersectorally, changes in *per capita* income may result shifts in the relative price of nontradables.

This perspective provides the key rationale for the well-known positive cross-sectional relationship between relative price (the inverse of q , i.e., $-q$) and relative *per capita* income levels. We exploit this relationship to determine whether the Chinese currency is undervalued. Obviously, this approach is not novel; it has been implemented recently by Frankel (2006) and Coudert and Couharde (2005). However, we will expand this approach along several dimensions. First, we augment the approach by incorporating the time series dimension.⁷ Second, we explicitly characterize the uncertainty surrounding our determinations of currency misalignment. Third, we examine the stability of the relative price and relative *per capita* income relationship using a) subsamples of certain country groups and time periods, and b) control variables.

3.3 Empirics

We compile a large data set encompassing up to 160 countries over the 1975-2005 period. Most of the data are drawn from the 2007 vintage of the World Bank's *World*

⁷ Coudert and Couharde (2005) implement the absolute PPP regression on a cross-section, while their panel estimation relies upon estimating the relationship between the relative price level to relative tradables to nontradables price indices.

Development Indicators (WDI). Because some data are missing, the panel is unbalanced.

Appendix 1 gives a greater detail on the data used in this subsection and elsewhere.⁸

Extending Frankel's (2006) cross-section approach, we estimate the real exchange rate-income relationship using a pooled time-series cross-section (OLS) regression, where all variables are expressed in terms relative to the US;

$$r_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 y_{it} + u_{it}, \quad (3)$$

where r is $-q$, and is expressed in real terms relative to the US price level, y is real *per capita* income also relative to the US.⁹ The results are reported in the first two columns of Table 2, for cases in which we measure relative *per capita* income in either USD exchange rates or PPP-based exchange rates.

One characteristic of estimating a pooled OLS regression is that it forces the intercept term to be the same across countries, and assumes that the error term is distributed identically over the entire sample. Because this is something that should be tested, rather than assumed, we also estimated random effects and fixed effects regressions. The former assumes that the individual specific error is uncorrelated with the right hand side variables, while the latter is efficient when this correlation is non-zero.¹⁰

⁸ Note that this analysis differs from that in Cheung et al. (2007b), in that we use an updated and revised data set, and exclude China from the regression.

⁹ β_0 can take on currency specific values if a fixed effects specification is implemented. Similarly, the error term is composed of a currency specific and aggregate error if the pooled OLS specification is dropped.

¹⁰ Since the price levels being used are comparable across countries, in principle there is no need to incorporate country-specific constants as in fixed effects or random effects regressions. In addition, fixed effects estimates are biased in the presence of serial correlation, which is documented in the subsequent analysis.

Random effects regressions do not yield substantially different results from those obtained using pooled OLS. Interestingly, when allowing the within and between coefficients to differ, we do find differing effects. In particular, with US\$ based *per capita* GDP, the within effect is much stronger than the between. This divergence is likely picking up short term effects, where output growth is correlated with other variables pushing up currency values. This pattern, however, is not present in results derived from the PPP-based output data.

Interestingly, the estimated elasticity of the price level with respect to *per capita* income does not appear to be particularly sensitive to measurements of *per capita* income. In all cases, the elasticity estimate is always around 0.25-0.39, which compares favorably with Frankel's (2006) 1990 and 2000 year cross-section estimates of 0.38 and 0.32, respectively.¹¹

One of the key emphases of our analysis is the central role accorded the quantification of the uncertainty surrounding the estimates. That is, in addition to estimating the economic magnitude of the implied misalignments, we also assess whether the implied misalignments are statistically different from zero. In Figure 7, we plot the actual and resulting predicted rates and standard error bands derived from the PPP-based data.¹² The results pertaining to US\$ based *per capita* GDP data – shown in Figure 8 – are qualitatively similar.

It is interesting to consider the path that the CNY has traced out Figure 7. It begins the sample as overvalued, and over the next three decades it moves toward the predicted equilibrium value and then overshoots, so that by 2005-06, it is substantially undervalued by about 60% in

¹¹ Note that, in addition to differences in the sample, our estimates differ from Frankel's in that we measure each country's (logged) real GDP per capita in terms relative to the US rather than in absolute terms.

¹² The 2006 value of the RMB is calculated from the IMF's *World Economic Outlook* (April 2007). (I think both the table results and figure reflect the new result when using 2007 vintage for all countries, not the initial results by excluding China.)

log terms (50% in absolute terms).¹³ It is indeed a puzzle that the CNY path is different from the one predicted by the Balassa-Samuelson hypothesis. In comparing the observations at 1975 and 2004, we found that countries including Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore also experienced an increase in their income but a decrease in their real exchange rates. On the other hand, Japan – a country typically used to illustrate the Balassa-Samuelson effect, has a positive real exchange rate – income relationship.

As shown in Figure 7, drawn the Renminbi's real (PPP adjusted) value appears not only to deviate from the line representing the “Penn Effect”, for several years it seems to be moving in a path nearly perpendicular to the line.

In Cheung *et al.* (2007b), we extended this analysis to allow for heterogeneity across country groupings (industrial versus less developed, high versus low, and regional) and time periods. After conducting various robustness checks, we conclude that although the point estimates indicate the CNY is undervalued in almost all samples, in almost no case is the deviation statistically significant, and indeed, when serial correlation is accounted for, the extent of misalignment is not even statistically significant at the 50% level. These findings highlight the great degree of uncertainty surrounding empirical estimates of “equilibrium real exchange rates”, thereby underscoring the difficulty in accurately assessing the degree of CNY undervaluation.

Nonetheless, to the extent that almost all such estimates indicate quantitatively substantial undervaluation, and sustained deviation from the price line, we are willing to consider the possibility that the real rate can be controlled for sustained periods of time. Taking the real exchange rate as somewhat exogenous, we can then plausibly consider the effects of changes in the Chinese yuan on Chinese trade flows.

¹³ The deviations in Figure 7 are somewhat smaller – 55% in log terms (42% in absolute terms).

4. A closer look at trade elasticities

4.1 Survey of trade elasticity estimates

The extant literature documenting the price of income responsiveness of Chinese trade flows is relatively small, and given the rapid pace of structural transformation, some of the earlier studies spanning the transition period is of limited relevance.

With respect to Chinese multilateral trade elasticities, there are few academic studies. One widely cited estimate from Goldman Sachs is for a Chinese export price elasticity of 0.2 and an import price elasticity of 0.5.¹⁴ Presumably, similar estimates underlie Goldstein's (2004) calculations, although they are not reported.

Kwack *et al.* (2007) uses a gravity model augmented with a CPI deflated real exchange rate to estimate elasticities over the 1984 to 2003 period. Using a panel of 29 developed and developing countries, he obtains a Chinese multilateral import price elasticity of 0.50 and an income elasticity of 1.57.¹⁵

Thorbecke and Smith (2007) do not directly examine the implications for both imports and exports, but do focus on the impact of CNY appreciation on exports, taking into account the integration of the production chain in the region. Using a sample of 33 countries over the 1994-2005 period, and a trade-weighted exchange rate that measures the impact of how bilateral exchange rates affect imported input prices, they find that a 10% CNY appreciation in the absence of changes in other East Asian currencies would result in a 3% decline in processed

¹⁴ O'Neill and Wilson (2003) as cited in Morrison and Labonte (2006).

¹⁵ Wang and Ji (2006) adopt a related approach, and find essentially zero effect of nominal exchange rates on Chinese imports and exports.

exports and an 11% decline in ordinary exports. If other East Asian currencies appreciated in line with the CNY, then the resulting change in the processed exports would be 9%.

Marquez and Schindler (forthcoming) argue that the absence of useful price indices for Chinese imports and exports requires the adoption of an alternative model specification. They treat the variable of interest as world (import or export) trade shares, broken down into “ordinary” and “parts and components”. Using monthly Chinese imports data from 1997 to July 2006, they find ordinary trade-share income “elasticities” ranging from -0.021 to -0.001 (i.e., the coefficients are *in the wrong direction*), and price “elasticities” from 0.013 to 0.021.¹⁶ The parts and components price elasticities are in the wrong direction, and statistically significantly so. Interestingly, the stock of FDI matters in almost all cases. Since the FDI stock is a smooth trend, it is not clear whether to attribute the effect explicitly to the effect of FDI, or to other variables that may be trending upward over time, including productive capacity.

For export shares (ordinary goods), they find income elasticities ranging from 0.08 to 0.09, and price elasticities ranging from 0.08 to 0.068. For parts and components export share, the income coefficient ranges from a 0.042 to 0.049. Their preferred specification implies that a ten-percent real appreciation of the Chinese Yuan reduces the Chinese trade balance between \$75 billion and \$92 billion.

Garcia-Herrero and Koivu (2007) come closest to our approach. They examine data over the 1995-2005 period, breaking the data into ordinary and processing/parts imports and exports. They relate Chinese exports to the world imports and the real effective exchange rate, augmented by a proxy measure for the value-added tax rebate on exports, and a capacity utilization variable.

¹⁶ Marquez and Schindler (forthcoming) conjecture that this counterintuitive result arises from the role of state owned enterprises. They also observe that this result can occur under certain configurations of substitutability between imported and domestic goods.

In both import and export equations, the stock of FDI is included. One notable result they obtain is that for Chinese imports, the real exchange rate coefficient has a sign opposite of anticipated in the full sample.

One particularly interesting result they obtain is that post-WTO entry, Chinese income and price elasticities for exports rise considerably. On the import side, no such change is obvious with respect to the pre- and post-WTO period.

In the bilateral vein, Mann and Plück (2007) investigate China-US trade. Using an error correction model specification applied to disaggregate bilateral data over the 1980-2004 period, they find extremely high income elasticities for US imports from China: for capital and consumer goods the estimated long run income elasticities are 10 and 4, respectively. The consumer good price elasticity is not statistically significant, while the capital good elasticity is implausibly high, around 10.¹⁷ On the other hand, US exports to China have a relatively low income elasticity of 0.74 and 2.25 for capital and consumer goods, respectively. The price elasticity estimates are not statistically significant. In general, they have difficulty obtaining sensible coefficient estimates.

Thorbecke (2006) examines aggregate bilateral US-China data over the 1988-2005 period. Using both the Johansen maximum likelihood method, as well as the Stock-Watson (1993) dynamic OLS methodology, he finds statistically significant evidence of cointegration between incomes, real exchange rates and CPI-deflated trade flows.

US imports from China have a real exchange rate elasticity ranging from 0.4 to 1.28 (depending upon the number of leads and lags in the DOLS specification). The income elasticity

¹⁷ Mann and Plück (2007) use disaggregate US trade flow and price index data from BEA. The reported income elasticities are for matched expenditure series, e.g., investment activity as the income variable in a regression involving capital goods.

ranges between 0.26 to 4.98. In all instances, substitution with ASEAN trade flows is accounted for by the inclusion of an ASEAN/Dollar real exchange rate. Interestingly, the income elasticities are not statistically significant, even when quantitatively large. For US exports to China, he obtains exchange rate elasticities ranging from 0.42 to 2.04, and income elasticities ranging from 1.05 to 1.21.

4.2 Multilateral trade elasticities

First, let us consider Chinese trade flows with respect to the rest-of-the-world. We estimate the following equations, where the designations import and export are from the Chinese perspective,

$$ex_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 y_t^* + \beta_2 q_t + \beta_3 z_t + u_{1,t}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$im_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 y_t + \gamma_2 q_t + \gamma_3 w_t + u_{2,t}, \quad (5)$$

where y is an activity variable, q is a real exchange rate, and z is a supply side variable. The variable w is a shift variable accounting for other factors that might increase import demand. The equations are estimated using the Stock-Watson (1993) dynamic OLS regression method with two leads and lags of first differences of the right hand side variables.

For the dependent variables, we have collected data on Chinese exports and imports from as early as 1980, to 2006, on a monthly basis. These data are in turn broken into ordinary and processing and parts trade flows. The multilateral data is sourced from Chinese Customs via CEIC. Import data are on a c.i.f. basis, while export data are f.o.b. We convert the monthly data into quarterly by simple averaging. These series are depicted in figures 9 and 10.

One particularly difficult issue involves price deflators. Until 2005, the Chinese did not report price indices for imports and exports. This limitation explains Marquez and Schindler's (forthcoming) reliance on a trade share variable. We attempt to circumvent this difficulty in a different manner, by relying on several proxy measures. Since the trade flows are reported in US dollars, the price measures we consider include the US CPI-all, the PPI for finished goods, the price indices reported by Gaulier, Lemoine and Ünal-Kesenci (2006, hereafter GLÜ-K), both at the aggregate level, and by stage of production, and finally using the Hong Kong re-export indices.

Below we report only the results based upon the PPI, the category-specific GLÜ-K indices, and the Hong Kong unit value indices; the remaining results are available upon request. We select these indices (shown in Figures 11-12) mostly on the grounds of pragmatism. The PPI appears to be a good proxy for tradable goods prices, while the GLU-K indices are carefully constructed and documented.

The Hong Kong unit value indices have typically been used in empirical analyses as proxy measures for Chinese trade (see Cheung, 2005). We use the Hong Kong to China re-export unit value indices to deflate Chinese imports and the Hong Kong to US re-export unit value indices to deflate Chinese exports.

The GLU-K indices have the drawback of being available only at the annual frequency, and then only up to 2004. We have used quadratic interpolation to translate the annual data into quarterly.

Our measure of the real exchange rate, q , is the IMF's CPI deflated trade-weighted index. For y^* , we use rest-of-the-world GDP evaluated in current US dollars, deflated into real terms using the US GDP deflator, while y is measured using real GDP (production based) expressed in

real 1990 yuan. For z , we assume that supply shifts out with the capital stock in manufacturing. This capital stock measure was calculated by Bai *et al.* (2006). This series is extended by assuming a 12% growth rate in 2005 and 2006, and interpolated to quarterly frequency using quadratic match averaging.

In Table 3, we present the results for Chinese exports, with Panel A for aggregate flows, Panel B for Ordinary exports, and Panel C for Parts and Processing. For each flow, we present coefficient estimates pertaining to real trade flows calculated using alternative deflators. The results in column [1] pertains to PPI deflated series, while that in column [2] pertains to that obtained when deflating with the GLU-K price series, and column [3] pertains to Hong Kong re-export unit value index deflated series. For now, the z term is suppressed.

There are two uniformly consistent results in all the regression results reported in Table 3. First, the income variable enters in with a very high (perhaps implausibly high) and statistically significant coefficient. Second, the real exchange rate enters in with a strongly negative sign – that is greater yuan depreciation induces less exports.¹⁸

Since these results seem so counterintuitive, we appeal to a supply shift variable. The standard imperfect goods model of imports and exports typically relies upon the real exchange rate index measuring the relative price of traded goods well. However, our exchange rate measure is the CPI-deflated exchange rate, which may or may not be a good measure of relative traded goods prices.¹⁹ Hence, we add in a measure of the supply side. In line with the approach

¹⁸ In these, and subsequent, estimates, the inclusion of a time trend often results in substantially different point estimates for the income elasticity. This outcome occurs because Chinese GDP and rest-of-the-world GDP look similar to a deterministic time trend.

¹⁹ Here we have adjusted the official rate to reflect the fact that many transactions took place through swap centers during the period leading up to 1994. See Fernald *et al.* (1999).

adopted in Helkie and Hooper (1988), we use a measure of the Chinese capital stock in manufacturing.

The results using this supply variable are quite interesting. As reported in Table 4, the supply variable coefficient is now the only one that is consistently significant. In addition, the income and price coefficients now take on more plausible coefficients, even though they are often not statistically significant.

In Panel A, overall exports are examined. The only statistically significant coefficients are on the supply variable. Of course, as suggested by Marquez and Schindler (forthcoming), the differing behavior of ordinary and processing exports suggests that aggregation is inappropriate. Panel B reports the results for ordinary exports. Here, one finds that the rest-of-the-world activity is not a good predictor of exports, while the price variable is an important determinant. Using either GUL-K or HK indices, one finds that the export elasticity of approximately 0.6. At the same time, a one percent increase in the Chinese manufacturing capital stock induces between a 2.2 and 2.5% increase in real exports.

Strangely, the rest-of-the-world GDP does affect positively processing output. Thorbecke and Smith (2007) argue that Chinese processing output is fairly sophisticated in nature; if so, that might explain the greater income sensitivity of such exports.

In Table 5, we turn to examining Chinese imports. We rely upon the same breakdown, with Panel A pertaining to aggregate imports, Panel B to ordinary imports and Panel C to processing and parts imports.

Aggregate imports appear to respond strongly to income, and in the expected direction. On the other hand, we replicate Marquez and Schindler's results with regard to the price elasticity. A weaker yuan induces greater imports, rather than less. This is true also for ordinary

imports. Only when moving to parts and processing imports does one obtain some mixed evidence, and there the results are still toward finding a wrong-signed coefficient.

The Marquez and Schindler results suggest including a role for foreign direct investment as our w variable. However, inclusion of a cumulative FDI variable is insufficient to overturn this result on a consistent basis.

In Panel D of Table 5, we interpret w as real total exports, in the specification involving parts and processing imports. Then we obtain a negative estimated elasticity for the real exchange rate, although the results can hardly be considered robust.

Given these mixed results, we have to be very careful in interpreting the estimated elasticities until such time as we have a long time series on Chinese trade prices.

4.3 China-US trade elasticities

In order to examine the behavior of the bilateral China-US trade balance, it is necessary to modify equations (4) and (5) to take into account the substitutability between Chinese goods and goods from competing countries. The resulting specifications are given by:

$$ex_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 y_t^* + \beta_2 q_t + \beta_3 z_t + \beta_4 \tilde{q}_t + u_{3,t}, \quad (6)$$

and

$$im_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 y_t + \gamma_2 q_t + \gamma_3 w_t + \gamma_4 \tilde{q}_t + u_{4,t}, \quad (7)$$

Where q_t is the bilateral real exchange rate, and \tilde{q}_t is an effective real exchange rate relative to China's other trading partners.

Two sets of bilateral data are obtained; the first is sourced from the People's Republic of China Customs agency, and the second from US Customs. The valuation conventions differ between the Chinese and US data as does the coverage. These differences are discussed in detail by Schindler and Beckett (2006). The relevant bilateral series are presented in Figures 13 and 14.

Now y^* is measured using US real GDP (in chained 2000 dollars). q_t is calculated by deflating the Chinese yuan (taking into account the transactions taking place at swap rates pre-1994) by the Chinese and US CPI. \tilde{q}_t is calculated using time-varying trade-weights based on Chinese trade flows, and bilateral real exchange rates calculated using CPIs. In the calculation of trade weights, we omitted Hong Kong, due to the difficulties in interpreting the trade with that economy.

Once again, our chief difficulty arises from the absence of an appropriate deflator. BLS reports a price index for Chinese imports into the US starting from 2004 onward, which affords a much too short time series for purposes of estimation. While the Chinese import price series has

tracked the import price index for East Asian Newly Industrializing Countries (NICs) over the period that we have Chinese statistics, it is clearly inappropriate to use the NICs series going back before June 1997, as China did not move its exchange rate with the other East Asian countries. Hence, for Chinese exports to the US we use a variety of proxy measures. The first is the US PPI for all finished goods. The second is a composite measure, that is the reported US import series for Chinese goods from January 2004 onward, the NICs series from January 2000 to end-2003, and the GLU-K consumer goods index from 1992 to end-1999. The third is the Hong Kong unit value index for re-exports to the US

The BLS does not report a price index for US exports to China. Since according to Chinese statistics, over half of Chinese imports from the US are categorized as machinery and electrical equipment in 2006, we chose to use as one of our proxies for Chinese import prices, the US capital goods export price index, in addition to the US PPI. A final proxy measure is the Hong Kong unit value index for imports from the United States. This means there are three deflators for each trade flow measure.

The results for Chinese exports are reported in Table 6. The three left hand side columns pertain to results obtained using US data, while the three right hand side columns pertain to results obtained using Chinese data. We do not report results omitting the supply shift variable as this leads to implausibly high income elasticities.

The estimated income elasticities based on US data are positive, but not statistically significant. On the other hand, there is a strong, statistically significant coefficient on the bilateral real exchange rate. In other words, as the Chinese currency depreciates against the dollar, Chinese exports to the US increase. In addition, as the Chinese currency depreciates against its trade partners, it gains a larger share of exports – vis a vis ASEAN and other

economies – to the US²⁰ However, this estimated effect is not particularly large and is nowhere near statistical significance. Finally, the supply shift variable comes in with a large positive and statistically significant coefficient.

Interestingly, when we use Chinese data, we obtain a negative coefficient on US income (significant in one instance). The other results remain intact, however. Hence, we can be reasonably confident that the bilateral real exchange rate does have an effect on bilateral trade flows.

Which set of estimates should we place more weight on? Since Schindler and Beckett (2006) argue that most of the error in calculating trade balances is attributable to China's inability to identify correctly the destination of Chinese exports trans-shipped through Hong Kong, we believe the results based on US data are of greater reliability, at least insofar as Chinese exports are concerned. For Chinese imports of US goods, Chinese data may be more reliable.²¹

In contrast to the results obtained for Chinese exports to the US, Chinese imports from the US are relatively well explained by Chinese income and – at least for US data -- the real exchange rate. Both elasticities are statistically significant and in the anticipated direction when using US data. However, the Chinese exchange rate relative to other trading partners once again do not enter in with any sort of recognizable pattern. Despite the similarity in the time series behavior of the US and Chinese data, when the latter are used, the coefficient on the bilateral real exchange rate is no longer statistically significant, nor is the sign negative.

²⁰ For a discussion of the complementary/substituting aspect of Chinese and ASEAN trade, see Ahearne *et al.* (2003).

²¹ See also the discussion in Fung and Lau (2001).

4.4 Policy Implications of the Estimates

There are some complications in drawing out the policy implications of these regression estimates. First, it is clear that the estimates are not robust to specification. Second, some of the key point estimates are not statistically significant. Third, some of the point estimates – when statistically significant – are counter-intuitive. In particular, the results pertaining to import elasticities are problematic.

For instance, consider a 10% appreciation. Using the point estimates from Table 4, column 3 of Panels B and C for exports, one finds that Chinese real exports (in 2000\$) decline from 952.3 billion (recorded in 2006) to 927.4 in the long run. On the other hand, using column 3 estimates from Panels B and D from Table 5, one finds that Chinese imports fall also *decline*, from 581.6 billion to 510.5 billion. This means that the trade balance *increases* from 400.9 billion to 416.9 billion, in response to a 10% real appreciation. (Note that parts and processing imports fall as total exports rise.)

The ordinary goods import price elasticity estimate of +2.6 drives this result. Alternative econometric specifications lead to different estimates. For instance, using a single equation error correction model, allowing for coefficient shifts with Chinese accession to WTO, leads to a statistically insignificant estimate of the price elasticity. In the 2000-06 period, the implied price elasticity is zero. Using this point estimate, then a 10% appreciation would actually lead to a shrinkage of the trade balance from 400.9 billion to 355.2 billion. This estimate of 45.7 billion (2000\$) is somewhat less than the \$88.6 billion current dollars reported in Marquez and Schindler (forthcoming).

Although the China-US trade balance is not, macroeconomically speaking, very interesting, for political reasons it has taken on heightened visibility.²² We can apply our estimates to answering the question of what would happen in response to a 10% appreciation of the CNY against the USD. Since both export and import and price elasticities are approximately unity (see column 3 in Tables 6 and 7), this implies the China-US trade balance would respond fairly strongly to yuan appreciation. Assuming unitary elasticities, the 2006 trade balance of 229.3 billion (2000\$) would fall to 195.9 billion, or by 33.4 billion. Of course, this does not mean that the overall US trade deficit would shrink. In fact, the deficit could be re-allocated to other countries, even as the Chinese surplus with the US fell.

Interestingly, our estimate is not that far away from Thorbecke's (2006) estimate of a long run decrease of 29 billion dollars in response to a 10% appreciation in 2005.

The ex-US trade weighted exchange rate (\tilde{q}) should capture the effect of the changes in the value of the yuan relative to the currencies of other countries that also export to the US. Unfortunately, the point estimate is not statistically significant at conventional levels. Hence, one can take the foregoing calculation in either of two ways. First, it assumes that the yuan moves against the US dollar, while holding its position relative to its trading partners constant – that is other countries aside from the US move their currencies in line with China's. Second, the other country effect is absent.

5. Concluding Thoughts

This study has aimed to illuminate some of the determinants of the Chinese exchange rate and China's external balance. In documenting the empirical record, we have highlighted one

²² See for instance Frankel and Wei's (2007) analysis of determinants of Treasury's decisions regarding currency manipulators.

particularly important fact: that many of the empirical relationships that can be identified are of a tenuous nature.

Turning first to the real value of the yuan, we reiterate the findings of Cheung *et al.* (2007b) – namely that the relationship between real per capita income and the real value of a currency in purchasing power parity terms is quite diffuse. We can be quite certain that a relationship exists, but the exact magnitude of the slope coefficient is subject to substantial uncertainty. And this is even before one adds in model uncertainty. Hence, we cannot reject the null hypothesis of no undervaluation at conventional levels of statistical significance. Of course, it is critical to remember that the failure to reject a null is *not* the same as acceptance of the null hypothesis.²³ Hence, we could also not reject the null that the yuan was 40% undervalued.

The same characterization applies to our findings regarding trade elasticities, perhaps even more so than in the case of the exchange rate. That outcome occurs for a number of reasons, in our view. First, in the approach adopted, we rely solely upon a single country's data, rather than appealing to cross-country data. Second, the data pertain to an economy experiencing rapid structural changes. These structural changes include a rapid build up in the capital stock, motivating our use of a proxy measure of China's supply capacity.²⁴

We also freely acknowledge that our approach, while fully in the spirit of conventional approach, may miss some important aspects of China's recent macroeconomic behavior. In particular, some observers have noted that the decline in import growth during the 2005-06 period was associated with a decline in consumption, which in turn has been driven by a

²³ As is cogently discussed in Frankel (1990).

²⁴ Marquez observes that assuming a constant income elasticity of imports while the import to GDP ratio increases over time presupposes a very specific behavior for the marginal propensity to import. An alternative is to impose a constant marginal propensity to import, and retrieving the implied time-varying income elasticities.

declining disposable income to GDP ratio and a rising saving to disposable income ratio (IMF, 2006). Since consumption behavior clearly affects imports and exports, omission of this factor is something to be examined in subsequent work.

With these caveats in mind, we conclude that there is some evidence that Chinese trade flows respond to changes in real exchange rates – as well as income levels. However, the price elasticities do not appear reliably estimated, and some estimates are counter-intuitive.

Our bottom line conclusion regarding the estimated elasticities is that the real exchange rate effect on overall trade flows – using typical point estimates – is relatively small, and sometimes goes in the direction opposite of anticipated. Using some plausible estimates, and zeroing out perverse estimates, we obtain for a 10% CNY real appreciation a 46 billion (2000\$) reduction in the Chinese trade balance, which while not inconsequential, is still not tremendously large when measured against a 2006 balance of 401 billion (2000\$).

These findings suggest that exchange rate policy alone will not be sufficient to reduce the Chinese trade surplus, especially when taken in the context of a trend increase in China's manufacturing capacity. Depending upon which specification is selected, slower growth in the rest-of-the-world could have substantial impact on Chinese exports. With less circumspection, one can assert that slower growth in the United States would have a substantial impact on the US trade deficit with China.

References

- Ahearne, Alan, John Fernald, Prakash Lougani, and John Schindler, 2003, "China and Emerging Asia: Comrades or Competitors?" *International Finance Discussion Paper* No. 789, (Washington, D.C.: Federal Reserve Board).
- Bai, Chong-En Bai, Chang-Tai Hsieh, and Qingyi Qian, 2006, "Returns to Capital in China," *Brookings Papers in Economic Activity* 2006(2).
- Balassa, Bela, 1964, The purchasing power parity doctrine: A reappraisal. *Journal of Political Economy* 72 (6), 584-596.
- Bosworth, Barry, 2004, "Valuing the Renminbi," paper presented at the Tokyo Club Research Meeting, February 9-10.
- Cairns, John, 2005a, "China: How Undervalued is the CNY?" IDEAglobal Economic Research (June 27).
- Cairns, John, 2005b, "Fair Value on Global Currencies: An Assessment of Valuation based on GDP and Absolute Price Levels," IDEAglobal Economic Research (May 10).
- Canzoneri, Matthew, Robert Cumby, and Behzad Diba, 1996, Relative labor productivity and the real exchange rate in the long run: Evidence for a panel of OECD countries. *Journal of International Economics* 47 (2), 245-66.
- Cerra, Valerie, and Anuradha, Dayal-Gulati, 1999, "China's Trade Flows-Changing Price Sensitivities and the Reform Process," *IMF Working Paper* 99/01.
- Cerra, Valerie, and Sweta Chaman Saxena, 2000, "An Empirical Analysis of China's Export Behavior," *IMF Working Paper* 02/200.
- Cheung, Yin-Wong, 2005, "An Analysis of Hong Kong Export Performance," *Pacific Economic Review* 10(3): 323-340.
- Cheung, Yin-Wong, Menzie Chinn and Eiji Fujii, forthcoming, "The illusion of precision and the role of the renminbi in regional integration," in Hamada, K., Reszat, B., Volz, U. (eds.), *Prospects for Monetary and Financial Integration in East Asia: Dreams and Dilemmas*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Cheung, Yin-Wong, Menzie Chinn and Eiji Fujii, 2007a, *The Economic Integration of Greater China: Real and Financial Linkages and the Prospects for Currency Union* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press).
- Cheung, Yin-Wong, Menzie Chinn and Eiji Fujii, 2007b, "The Overvaluation of Renminbi Undervaluation," *Journal of International Money and Finance* 26(5) (September): 762-785. Also *NBER Working Paper* No. 12850.

- Chinn, Menzie, 2005, "Supply Capacity, Vertical Specialization and Tariff Rates: The Implications for Aggregate US Trade Flow Equations," *NBER Working Paper* No. 11719 (October).
- Chinn, Menzie, 2000a, "Before the Fall: Were East Asian Currencies Overvalued?" *Emerging Markets Review* 1(2) (August): 101-126.
- Chinn, Menzie, 2000b, "The Usual Suspects? Productivity and Demand Shocks and Asia-Pacific Real Exchange Rates," *Review of International Economics* 8(1) (February): 20-43.
- Chinn, Menzie and Hiro Ito, 2007, "Current Account Balances, Financial Development and Institutions: Assaying the World 'Saving Glut'," *Journal of International Money and Finance* 26(4): 546-569.
- Chinn, Menzie and Eswar Prasad, 2003, "Medium-Term Determinants of Current Accounts in Industrial and Developing Countries: An Empirical Exploration," *Journal of International Economics* 59(1) (January): 47-76.
- Coudert, Virginie and Cécile Couharde, 2005, "Real Equilibrium Exchange Rate in China," *CEPII Working Paper* 2005-01 (Paris, January).
- De Gregorio, Jose and Holger Wolf, 1994. Terms of trade, productivity, and the real exchange rate. NBER Working Paper No. 4807.
- Dunaway, Steven Vincent, Lamin Leigh, and Xiangming Li, 2006, "How Robust are Estimates of Equilibrium Real Exchange Rates: The Case of China," *IMF Working Paper* No. 06/220 (Washington, D.C.: IMF, October).
- Fernald, John, Hali Edison, and Prakash Loungani, 1999, "Was China the First Domino? Assessing Links between China and Other Asian Economies," *Journal of International Money and Finance* 18 (4): 515-535.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A., 2006, "On the Yuan: The Choice Between Adjustment Under a Fixed Exchange Rate and Adjustment under a Flexible Rate," in *Understanding the Chinese Economy*, edited by Gerhard Illing, CESifo Economic Studies, vol. 52, no. 2, (Oxford University Press), 246-275. Also *NBER Working Paper* No. 11274 (April 2005).
- Frankel, Jeffrey A., 1990, "Zen and the Art of Modern Macroeconomics: A Commentary," in *Monetary Policy for a Volatile Global Economy*, W. S. Haraf and T. D. Willett (eds.) (Washington, D.C.: AEI Press), pp. 117-23.
- Frankel, Jeffrey A. and Shang-Jin Wei, 2007, "Assessing China's Exchange Rate Regime," *NBER Working Paper* No. 13100 (May).

- Fung, K.C. and Lawrence J. Lau, 2001, “New Estimates of the United States–China Bilateral Trade Balances,” *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 15: 102-130.
- Funke, Michael and Jörg Rahn, 2005, “Just how undervalued is the Chinese renminbi?” *World Economy* 28:465-89.
- Garcia-Herrero, Alicia and Tuuli Koivu, 2007, “Can the Chinese Trade Surplus Be Reduced through Exchange Rate Policy?” *BOFIT Discussion Papers* No. 2007-6 (Helsinki: Bank of Finland, March).
- Gaulier, Guillaume, Françoise Lemoine and Deniz Ünal, 2006, “China’s Emergence and the Reorganization of Trade Flows in Asia,” *CEPII Working Paper* No. 2006-05 (Paris: CEPII, March).
- Goldstein, Morris, 2004, “China and the Renminbi Exchange Rate,” in C. Fred Bergsten and John Williamson (editors), *Dollar Adjustment: How Far? Against What?* Special Report 17 (Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics, November), pp. 197-230.
- Government Accountability Office, 2005, International Trade: Treasury Assessments Have Not Found Currency Manipulation, but Concerns about Exchange Rates Continue,” *Report to Congressional Committees* GAO-05-351 (Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office, April).
- Helkie, William L., and Peter Hooper, 1988, “An Empirical Analysis of the External Deficit, 1980-86,” in Ralph C. Bryant, Gerald Holtham, and Peter Hooper (eds.), *External Deficits and The Dollar, The Pit, and the Pendulum* (Washington: Brookings Institution).
- Hsieh, David, 1982, The determination of the real exchange rate: The productivity approach. *Journal of International Economics* 12 (2), 355-362.
- IMF, “People’s Republic of China: 2006 Article IV Consultation—Staff Report,” *IMF Country Report* No. 06/394 (Washington, D.C.: IMF, October).
- Isard, Peter, and Faruquee, Hamid, 1998, *Exchange Rate Assessment: Extension of the Macroeconomic Balance Approach*, IMF Occasional Paper No. 167 (Washington, D.C.: IMF, July).
- Kwack, Sung Yeung, Choong Y. Ahn, Young S. Lee, Doo Y. Yang, 2007, “Consistent Estimates of World Trade Elasticities and an Application to the Effects of Chinese Yuan (RMB) Appreciation,” *Journal of Asian Economics* 18: 314–330.
- Mann, Catherine and Plück, Katerina, 2007, “The US Trade Deficit: A Disaggregated Perspective,” in R. Clarida (ed.), *G7 Current Account Imbalances: Sustainability and Adjustment* (U. Chicago Press). Also *Institute for International Economics Working* No. 05-11, (Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics, 2005).

Marquez, Jaime and John W. Schindler, forthcoming, "Exchange-Rate Effects on China's Trade," *Review of International Economics*. Also *International Finance and Discussion Papers* No. 861 (Washington, D.C: Federal Reserve Board, May).

McCown, T. Ashby, Patricia Pollard and John Weeks, 2007, "Equilibrium Exchange Rate Models and Misalignments," *Office of International Affairs Occasional Paper* No. 7 (Washington, D.C.: US Treasury, March).

Morrison, Wayne and Marc Labonte, 2005, "China's Currency: Economic Issues and Options for US Trade Policy," *CRS Report for Congress* RL32165 (April 18).

O'Neill, Jim and Dominic Wilson, 2003, "How China Can Help the World," *Goldman Sachs Global Economics Paper* No. 97 (Sept. 17).

Samuelson, Paul, 1964. Theoretical notes on trade problems. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 46 (2), 145-154.

Schindler, John W. and Dustin H. Beckett, 2005, "Adjusting Chinese Bilateral Trade Data: How Big is China's Trade Surplus," *International Finance Discussion Paper* No 2005-831 (Washington, D.C.: Federal Reserve Board, April)

Stock, James, and Watson, Mark, 1993, "A Simple Estimator of Cointegrated Vectors in Higher Order Integrated Systems," *Econometrica* 61: 783-820.

Thorbecke, Willem, 2006, "How Would an Appreciation of the Renminbi Affect the US Trade Deficit with China?" *BE Press Macro Journal* 6(3): Article 3.

Thorbecke, Willem and Gordon Smith, 2007, "How Would an Appreciation of the RMB and Other East Asian Currencies Affect China's Exports?" *mimeo* (Fairfax, VA: George Mason University, June).

Wang, Jiao and Andy G. Ji, 2006, "Exchange Rate Sensitivity of China's Bilateral Trade Flows," *BOFIT Discussion Papers* No. 2006-19 (Helsinki: Bank of Finland, December).

Wang, Tao, 2004, "Exchange Rate Dynamics," in Eswar Prasad (editor), *China's Growth and Integration into the World Economy*, Occasional Paper No. 232 (Washington, D.C.: IMF), pp. 21-28.

Data Appendix

The data used for the real exchange rate portion of the paper (Section 3) were drawn from a number of different sources. For most countries, data were available from 1971 through 2005, and drawn from the World Bank's *World Development Indicators*. Taiwanese data are drawn from the Central Bank of China, International Center for the Study of East Asian Development (ICSEAD), and Asian Development Bank, *Key Indicators of Developing Asian and Pacific Countries*.

The data used for the trade elasticities portion of the paper (Section 4) are drawn from a variety of sources.

- Official exchange rates from IMF *International Financial Statistics* and “swap rates” from personal communication with John Fernald.
- Total Chinese exports and imports, from Chinese Customs, via CEIC.
- China-US trade flows, from China Customs, via CEIC, and from US BEA/Census via Haver.
- Price deflators from various sources.
 - US CPI-all and PPI (finished goods), from US Bureau of Labor Statistics, via FRED II.
 - Overall price indices for Chinese exports and imports, and category-specific price indices, in USD terms, as described in Gaulier *et al.* (2006); personal communication from Guillaume Gaulier.
 - Price indices for US imports from China, East Asian Newly Industrializing Countries (NICs), from Bureau of Labor Statistics.

- Chinese real GDP seasonally adjusted (from CEIC). US real GDP drawn from Bureau of Economic Analysis (June 28, 2007 release).
- The Chinese nominal and real trade-weighted exchange rates from *IFS*.
- The bilateral USD/CNY exchange rate adjusted for swap transactions was provided by John Fernald.
- Chinese CPI drawn from CEIC, updated using IMF, *International Financial Statistics* year-on-year growth rates.
- The Chinese capital stock in manufacturing, as described in Bai *et al.* (2006), was provided by Chang-Tai Hsieh. This series is assumed to grow by 12% in 2005 and 2006, and is interpolated to a quarterly frequency using quadratic match averaging.

Table 1: Studies of the Equilibrium Exchange Rate of the Renminbi

	Relative PPP, Competitiveness	Absolute PPP- Income Relationship	Balassa- Samuelson (with productivity)	BEER	Macroeconomic Balance/External Balance
				Zhang (2001); Wang (2004); Funke & Rahn (2005)	Bosworth (2004); Goldstein (2004); Wang (2004)
Time Series	CCF (forthcoming); Wang (2004)	Bosworth (2004) Frankel (2006); Coudert & Couharde (2005)	CCF (forthcoming)		
Cross Section					
Panel		Cairns (2005b); CCF (2007b)		CCF (forthcoming)	Coudert & Couharde (2005)

Notes: Relative PPP indicates the real exchange rate is calculated using price or cost indices and no determinants are accounted for. Absolute PPP indicates the use of comparable price deflators to calculate the real exchange rate. Balassa-Samuelson (with productivity) indicates that the real exchange rate (calculated using price indices) is modeled as a function of sectoral productivity levels. BEER indicates composite models using net foreign assets, relative tradable to nontradable price ratios, trade openness, or other variables. Macroeconomic Balance indicates cases where the equilibrium real exchange rate is implicit in a “normal” current account (or combination of current account and persistent capital inflows, for the External Balance approach). CCF denotes Cheung, Chinn and Fujii.

Table 2: The panel estimation results of the real exchange rate – income relationship

	USD-based GDP				PPP-based GDP			
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
	Pooled OLS	Between	Fixed effects (Within)	Random effects	Pooled OLS	Between	Fixed effects (Within)	Random effects
GDP per capita	0.259** (0.003)	0.259** (0.013)	0.387** (0.020)	0.309** (0.012)	0.317** (0.005)	0.309** (0.025)	0.386** (0.020)	0.361** (0.013)
Constant	-.023** (0.008)	-.040 (0.044)	-	.099** (0.036)	-.147** (0.010)	-.184** (0.055)	-	-.084* (0.037)
Adjusted R ²	0.564	0.677	0.800	0.564	0.413	0.467	0.800	0.413
F-test statistic			33.557**				54.362**	
Hausman test statistic				19.013**				0.167
Number of observations	4600				4600			

Notes: The data covers 168 countries over the maximum of a thirty-one-years period from 1975 to 2005. The panel is unbalanced due to some missing observations. ** and * indicate 1% and 5% levels of significance, respectively. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are given in parentheses underneath coefficient estimates. For the fixed effects models, the F-test statistics are reported for the null hypothesis of the equality of the constants across all countries in the sample. For the random effects models, the Hausman test statistics test for the independence between the time-invariant country-specific effects and the regressor.

Table 3: Chinese Export Elasticities

Panel A: Aggregate Exports			
	[1]	[2]	[3]
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y*	5.23*** (0.29)	5.30*** (1.42)	6.01*** (0.35)
q	-1.63*** (0.39)	-2.14*** (0.68)	-1.69*** (0.47)
z			
Adj.R ²	0.89	0.76	0.88
SER	0.186	0.272	0.223
Sample	93Q3-06Q2	93Q3-04Q2	93Q3-06Q2
Panel B: Ordinary Exports			
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y*	4.98*** (0.32)	4.82*** (1.52)	5.76*** (0.38)
q	-1.46*** (0.42)	-2.00*** (0.73)	-1.51*** (0.50)
z			
Adj.R ²	0.85	0.68	0.84
SER	0.209	0.293	0.244
Sample	93Q3-06Q2	93Q3-04Q2	93Q3-06Q2
Panel C: Processing and Parts Exports			
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y*	5.35*** (0.27)	5.14*** (1.15)	6.13*** (0.33)
q	-1.86*** (0.37)	-2.68*** (0.56)	-1.92*** (0.45)
z			
Adj.R ²	0.92	0.84	0.90
SER	0.171	0.220	0.208
Sample	93Q3-06Q2	93Q3-04Q2	93Q3-06Q2

Notes: Point estimates are obtained from DOLS(2,2). Robust standard errors are given in parentheses. *(**)[***] indicates significance at the 10%(5%)[1%] level. The price elasticity estimate should be positive for Chinese exports. PPI indicates US PPI-finished goods is used as the deflator; GLUK indicates the Gaulier *et al.* (2006) consumer good index is used as the deflator; HK UV indicates the Hong Kong unit value index for re-exports to the World is used as the deflator.

Table 4: Chinese Export Elasticities

Panel A: Aggregate Exports			
	[1]	[2]	[3]
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y*	0.57 (0.40)	-0.56 (0.53)	0.31 (0.40)
q	-0.06 (0.23)	0.26 (0.22)	0.27 (0.22)
z	1.68*** (0.16)	2.35*** (0.16)	2.06*** (0.15)
Adj.R ²	0.98	0.98	0.99
SER	0.077	0.080	0.076
Sample	93Q3-06Q2	93Q3-04Q2	93Q3-06Q2
Panel B: Ordinary Exports			
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y*	0.04 (0.55)	-1.26 (0.75)	-0.22 (0.55)
q	0.31 (0.32)	0.61* (0.31)	0.64* (0.32)
z	1.83*** (0.22)	2.51*** (0.22)	2.22*** (0.22)
Adj.R ²	0.96	0.96	0.97
SER	0.106	0.108	0.105
Sample	93Q3-06Q2	93Q3-04Q2	93Q3-06Q2
Panel C: Processing and Parts Exports			
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y*	0.98*** (0.30)	0.26 (0.32)	0.72** (0.31)
q	-0.47** (0.19)	-0.62*** (0.16)	-0.14 (0.18)
z	1.52*** (0.11)	1.99*** (0.10)	1.91*** (0.11)
Adj.R ²	0.92	0.99	0.99
SER	0.065	0.060	0.062
Sample	93Q3-06Q2	93Q3-04Q2	93Q3-06Q2

Notes: Point estimates are obtained from DOLS(2,2). Robust standard errors are given in parentheses. *(**)[***] indicates significance at the 10%(5%)[1%] level. The price elasticity estimate should be positive for Chinese exports. PPI indicates US PPI-finished goods is used as the deflator; GLUK indicates the Gaulier *et al.* (2006) consumer good index is used as the deflator; HK UV indicates the Hong Kong unit value index for re-exports to the World is used as the deflator. Supply is the Bai *et al.* (2006) measure of the Chinese capital stock in manufacturing.

Table 5: Chinese Import Elasticities

Panel A: Aggregate Imports			
	[1]	[2]	[3]
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y	1.78*** (0.06)	1.41*** (0.04)	2.16*** (0.06)
q	1.48*** (0.38)	0.39** (0.19)	1.54*** (0.32)
Adj.R ²	0.99	0.98	0.99
SER	0.056	0.050	0.055
Sample	94Q4-06Q2	94Q4-04Q2	94Q4-06Q2
Panel B: Ordinary Imports			
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y	2.16*** (0.26)	2.40*** (0.32)	2.54*** (0.27)
q	2.75** (1.18)	2.25** (1.06)	2.80** (1.19)
Adj.R ²	0.85	0.94	0.94
SER	0.209	0.152	0.196
Sample	94Q4-06Q2	94Q4-04Q2	94Q4-06Q2
Panel C: Processing and Parts Imports			
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y	1.68*** (0.08)	0.85*** (0.13)	2.06*** (0.06)
q	1.15*** (0.35)	-0.25 (0.34)	1.20*** (0.28)
R ²	0.98	0.88	0.99
SER	0.072	0.080	0.060
Sample	94Q4-06Q2	94Q4-04Q2	94Q4-06Q2
Panel D: Processing and Parts Imports			
	PPI	GLUK	HK UV
y	-0.40* (0.20)	-1.86* (0.93)	-0.04 (0.25)
q	-0.13 (0.23)	-1.64*** (0.58)	-0.16 (0.22)
w	1.10*** (0.13)	1.20*** (0.40)	0.96*** (0.12)
Adj.R ²	0.99	0.89	0.99
SER	0.037	0.074	0.035
Sample	94Q4-06Q2	94Q4-04Q2	94Q4-06Q2

Notes: Point estimates are obtained from DOLS(2,2). Robust standard errors are given in parentheses. *(**)[***] indicates significance at the 10%(5%)[1%] level. The price elasticity estimate should be negative for Chinese imports. PPI indicates US PPI-finished goods is used as the deflator; GLUK indicates the Gaulier *et al.* (2006) capital goods and parts index is used as the deflator for aggregate, capital goods for ordinary and parts for processing and parts; HK UV indicates the Hong Kong unit value index for re-exports is used as the deflator. The demand shift variable w is total real exports.

Table 6: Chinese Bilateral Export Elasticities (China-US)

	US Data			Chinese Data		
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
	PPI	P	HK UV	PPI	P	HK UV
y	0.03 (0.80)	0.59 (0.73)	0.56 (0.75)	-1.75* (0.99)	-1.19 (0.92)	-0.62 (0.99)
q	0.80*** (0.22)	1.27*** (0.22)	1.05*** (0.20)	1.55*** (0.30)	2.03*** (0.29)	1.65*** (0.31)
q~	0.47 (0.72)	0.68 (0.67)	1.04 (0.71)	1.31 (0.88)	1.52 (0.89)	1.08 (0.80)
z	.82*** (0.32)	2.14*** (0.31)	2.04*** (0.33)	3.12*** (0.47)	3.45*** (0.45)	2.98*** (0.46)
Adj.R ²	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
SER	0.040	0.039	0.042	0.049	0.048	0.048
Sample	93Q4- 06Q2	93Q4- 06Q2	93Q4- 06Q2	93Q4- 06Q2	93Q4- 06Q2	93Q4- 06Q2

Notes: Point estimates are obtained from DOLS(2,2). Robust standard errors are given in parentheses. (**)[***] indicates significance at the 10%(5%)[1%] level. PPI indicates US PPI-finished goods is used as the deflator; P indicates the composite import price deflator is used (see text); HK UV indicates the Hong Kong Unit Value index for re-exports to the US is used. Supply is the Bai *et al.* measure of the Chinese capital stock in manufacturing.

Table 7: Chinese Bilateral Import Elasticities (China-US)

	US Data			Chinese Data		
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
	PPI	P	HK UV	PPI	P	HK UV
y	1.45*** (0.33)	2.02*** (0.35)	1.85*** (0.32)	1.24** (0.46)	1.81*** (0.48)	1.65*** (0.45)
q	-1.31*** (0.33)	-1.13*** (0.32)	-0.99*** (0.32)	0.25 (0.39)	0.43 (0.42)	0.57 (0.45)
q~	-0.26 (1.06)	0.69 (1.10)	-0.21 (1.04)	0.36 (1.51)	1.32 (1.56)	0.42 (1.51)
Adj.R ²	0.95	0.96	0.97	0.95	0.96	0.97
SER	0.101	0.101	0.100	0.087	0.091	0.087
Sample	94Q4- 06Q2	94Q4- 06Q2	94Q4- 06Q2	94Q4- 06Q2	94Q4- 06Q2	94Q4- 06Q2

Notes: Point estimates are obtained from DOLS(2,2). Robust standard errors are given in parentheses. (**)[***] indicates significance at the 10%(5%)[1%] level. PPI indicates US PPI-finished goods is used as the deflator; P indicates the US capital goods export price deflator is used (see text); HK UV indicates HK Unit Value index for imports from the US is used.




Figure 1: Official nominal and real CNY/USD, 1986M01-2007M06. Source: IMF, *International Financial Statistics*, and authors' calculations.




Figure 2: Official and “swap” CNY/USD rate, 1986M01-2007M06. Source: IMF, *International Financial Statistics*, and Fernald *et al.* (1999).




Figure 3: Adjusted nominal and real CNY/USD, 1986M01-2007M06. Source: IMF, *International Financial Statistics*, Fernald *et al.* (1999) and authors' calculations.




Figure 4: Log trade weighted real CNY exchange rate, 1986M01-2007M02, and linear time trend. Source: IMF, *International Financial Statistics*, and authors' calculations.




Figure 5: Current account balance (in billions of US dollars) and current account to GDP ratio. Statistics for 2006-07 are IMF projections. Source: IMF, *World Economic Outlook* (April 2007), and authors' calculations.



Figure 6: Trade balance and bilateral China-US trade balance, in billions of US dollars at annual rates. China-US balance is simple average of Chinese and US data. Source: CEIC, BEA/Census via Haver, and authors' calculations.

Relative price level




Figure 7: The rate of RMB misalignment based on the pooled OLS estimates with the PPP-based per capita income, 1975-2004. Chinese 2006 data are from *World Economic Outlook*.

Relative price level




Figure 8: The rate of RMB misalignment based on the pooled OLS estimates with the USD-based per capita income, 1975-2004. Chinese 2006 data are from *World Economic Outlook*.




Figure 9: Chinese total, ordinary and processing and parts exports, in billions of US dollars, at annual rates.




Figure 10: Chinese total, ordinary and processing and parts imports, in billions of US dollars, at annual rates.




Figure 11: Deflators for Chinese exports; US PPI, consumption good-based price index from Gaulier *et al.*, and Hong Kong re-export to World unit value index. All series in logs, rescaled to 2000Q1=0.




Figure 12: Deflators for Chinese imports; US PPI, capital good-based price index from Gaulier *et al.*, and Hong Kong re-export to China unit value index. All series in logs, rescaled to 2000Q1=0.




Figure 13: Chinese exports to the United States, in billions of US dollars, at annual rates.




Figure 14: Chinese imports from the United States, in billions of US dollars, at annual rates.