DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

No. 4610

THE FELDSTEIN-HORIOKA FACT

Domenico Giannone and Michele Lenza

INTERNATIONAL MACROECONOMICS

Centre for **E**conomic **P**olicy **R**esearch

www.cepr.org

THE FELDSTEIN-HORIOKA FACT

Domenico Giannone, ECARES, Université Libre de Bruxelles
Michele Lenza, ECARES, Université Libre de Bruxelles

ABSTRACT

The Feldstein-Horioka Fact*

This Paper shows that general equilibrium effects can partly rationalize the high correlation between saving and investment observed in OECD countries. We introduce a novel factor augmented panel regression to control for general equilibrium effects where global shocks are allowed to affect each country with specific magnitude and lag structure. We show that the homogeneity restriction on the propagation of global shocks across countries is rejected by the data and biases the saving-retention coefficient estimated in previous studies. By relaxing this assumption, the saving-retention coefficient remains high in the 70s but decreases considerably over time becoming very small in the last two decades. This finding is explained by the increased capital mobility in OECD countries.

Domenico Giannone
ECARES ULB
CP114
50 Avenue Franklin D Roosevelt
1050 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: (32 2) 650 3373
Fax: (32 2) 650 4475
Email: dgiannon@ulb.ac.be

Michele Lenza
ECARES ULB
CP114
50 Avenue Franklin D Roosevelt
1050 Brussels
BELGIUM
Email: mlenza@ulb.ac.be

1 Introduction

The Feldstein-Horioka puzzle is one of the six major puzzles in International Macroeconomics (Obstfeld and Rogoff, 2000). Domestic saving and investment are highly correlated both within and between OECD countries: in years when and countries where saving is high, so is investment. This fact seems incompatible with the Intertemporal Theory of the Current Account. Assuming perfect capital mobility, such a theory predicts that the determinants of saving and investment are not the same. Hence, countries should borrow and lend abroad whenever they need to invest or disinvest, without being constrained by domestic saving decisions. Feldstein and Horioka, 1980 interpreted their finding as evidence of low capital mobility among OECD countries. However, in the decades following the publication of Feldstein and Horioka results, capital mobility among OECD countries has kept on increasing while the correlation between saving and investment has only slightly decreased.

On the other hand, the Intertemporal Theory of the Current Account fails to consider general equilibrium effects and the latters, it has been argued, could provide an explanation for the puzzle. Since the world, as a whole, is a closed economy, world saving and investment have to be equal. Consequently, a common shock which, say, positively affects saving decisions of all the countries, tends to create imbalance in world capital markets and decreases the world interest rate. This, in turn, increases world investment and generates a positive correlation between saving and investment in all countries. Partial equilibrium predictions of the theory are more likely to hold, then, in response to idiosyncratic sources of fluctuations whose effect on world capital markets is likely to be negligible. Since global shocks are acknowledged to be an important force driving the world business cycle (see, for example, Gregory and Head, 1999 and

Kose, Otrok and Whiteman, 2003), general equilibrium effects should reconcile theory and evidence. However, empirical studies have failed to rationalize the puzzle (see, for example, Glick and Rogoff, 1995 and Ventura, 2002). Consequently, a belief has risen that the high saving - investment correlation can only be explained by introducing frictions in international good or financial markets (Ventura, 2002, Obstfeld and Rogoff, 2000 are two examples of this view).

This paper revisits the general equilibrium explanation and shows that, unlike what claimed by existing empirical studies, it does help rationalize the puzzle. Previous attempts to control for the effects of global shocks in saving and investment regressions assume homogeneity of their transmission mechanisms across countries. We propose a new methodology, factor augmented panel regression, to isolate idiosyncratic sources of fluctuations. It improves on existing studies since countries are allowed to react with specific sign, magnitude and lag structure to global shocks. We show that the homogeneity restriction is rejected by the data and biases the estimation of the saving-retention coefficient. Indeed, allowing for heterogeneous propagation mechanism of global shocks, the saving-retention coefficient drops significantly from the 80's on, consistently with the increase in capital mobility across OECD countries.

The structure of the paper is the following. In section 2, we review commonly used methods to control for comovement and propose the novel factor augmented panel regression. Section 3 presents empirical results. Section 4 concludes.

2 General Equilibrium and the saving-retention coefficient

Many studies document the existence of strong cross country linkages in macroeconomic fluctuations (for a survey see Kose, Otrok and Whiteman, 2003). This suggests

that international fluctuations are driven by few common sources which can generate positive correlation between saving and investment through general equilibrium mechanisms. Such positive correlation is not in contradiction with the partial equilibrium Intertemporal Theory of the Current Account, whose predictions are conditional on idiosyncratic (country specific or regional) shocks which, not affecting all the countries, are unlikely to generate imbalance in the world capital market. Formally, consider the following representation for saving $(S_{j,t})$ and investment $(I_{j,t})$ ratio to GDP of country j at time t:

$$S_{j,t} = \lambda_{1,j}^S f_{1,t} + \ldots + \lambda_{r,j}^S f_{r,t} + S_{j,t}^{id} \tag{1}$$

$$I_{j,t} = \lambda_{1,j}^I f_{1,t} + \ldots + \lambda_{r,j}^I f_{r,t} + I_{j,t}^{id} \tag{2}$$

where $f_{i,t}, i = 1, \ldots, r$ are few global factors affecting saving and investment of all countries while $S_{j,t}^{id}$ and $I_{j,t}^{id}$ are the idiosyncratic components of saving and investment that are assumed to be driven by non pervasive (idiosyncratic) shocks. The factor loadings $\lambda_{i,j}^S$, $\lambda_{i,j}^I$ $(j = 1, \ldots, N, \ i = 1, \ldots, r)$ are country specific and capture the heterogeneity in the transmission mechanisms of global shocks. In particular, each variable can react with a specific sign and intensity to the global factors $f_{i,t}$ $(i = 1, .., r)$[1].

For the reasons outlined above, the Intertemporal Theory of the Current Account refers to idiosyncratic components of saving and investment. We consider the following relationship

$$I_{j,t}^{id} = \alpha_j + \beta S_{j,t}^{id} + \varepsilon_{j,t} \tag{3}$$

where β is the saving-retention coefficient conditional to idiosyncratic shocks or, in

---

[1]Heterogeneous dynamic responses of saving and investment of each country are also allowed since some factors can be the lagged version of others. For example, a model with one global factor with contemporaneous and lagged effects is a particular case of (1) and (2) with $r = 2$ and $f_{2,t} = f_{1,t-1}$.

terms of long run fluctuations,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} I_{j,t}^{id} = \bar{\alpha}_j + \beta_L \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} S_{j,t}^{id} + \bar{\varepsilon}_j \tag{4}$$

Equations (1) and (2) imply that (3) and (4) can be rewritten in terms of observable saving and investment as

$$I_{j,t} = \alpha_j + \beta S_{j,t} + \delta_{1,j} f_{1,t} + \ldots + \delta_{r,j} f_{r,t} + \varepsilon_{j,t} \tag{5}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} I_{j,t} = \bar{\alpha}_j + \beta_L \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} S_{j,t} + \delta_{1,j}^{L} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_{1,t} + \ldots + \delta_{r,j}^{L} \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_{r,t} + \bar{\varepsilon}_j \tag{6}$$

where $\delta_{i,j} = \left(\lambda_{i,j}^{I} - \beta\lambda_{i,j}^{S}\right)$ and $\delta_{i,j}^{L} = \left(\lambda_{i,j}^{I} - \beta^{L}\lambda_{i,j}^{S}\right)$. Notice that the coefficients $\delta_{i,j}$ and $\delta_{i,j}^{L}$ can vary along the cross section dimension since they are function of factor loadings of domestic saving and investment in different countries. Assume, for example, that $\beta = 0$ or $\beta_L = 0$, in equation (3) and (4); in that case, the $\delta_{i,j}$'s or $\delta_{i,j}^{L}$'s would be equal across countries only if the $\lambda_{i,j}^{I}$ were equal across countries or, in other words, if the response of the investment/GDP ratio to common shocks was the same in all countries.

Let us investigate the consequences of equation (5) and (6) for the methodologies commonly used in the Feldstein-Horioka debate. We argue that, indeed, all of them are not robust to the introduction of heterogeneity in the transmission mechanisms of global shocks.

In their seminal paper, Feldstein and Horioka performed the following "long run" regression:

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} I_{j,t} = \mu + \beta_L \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} S_{j,t} + \bar{\eta}_j \tag{7}$$

Temporal aggregation averages out from the data short and medium run fluctuations. Therefore, the long run regression (7) is able to control for short and medium run

5

effects of global shocks on saving and investment. On the other hand, time aggregation does not average out the long run effects of global factors. Whenever these effects are significantly different across saving and investment in different countries, the country specific long run effect of global shocks $\left(\delta_{1,j}^L \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} f_{1,t} + \ldots + \delta_{r,j}^L \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} f_{r,t} \right)$ will not be captured by the constant term μ and, hence, will be contained in the error $\bar{\eta}_j$. Since observed saving is also affected by global shocks, the estimation of β_L is not consistent.

Estimation methods alternative to the long run regression of Feldstein and Horioka have been proposed in order to investigate the relation between saving and investment and, invariably, they end up with results that point to a high correlation between saving and investment. Let us start considering the consequences of estimating β by a "baseline panel regression" or, more precisely,

$$I_{j,t} = \alpha_j + \beta S_{j,t} + \eta_{j,t} \tag{8}$$

when the data generating process is given by (1) and (2). From (5) it can be easily seen that the error term $\eta_{j,t}$ contains the common factors and is correlated with the regressors. Then, the estimates based on equation (8) are not consistent.

A method generally proposed to correct for this problem consists in adding time dummies to the "baseline panel regression" (8) by specifying the following regression equation

$$I_{j,t} = \alpha_j + \gamma_t + \beta S_{j,t} + \zeta_{j,t} \tag{9}$$

where γ_t is the so called "time effect"[2]. However this method is not always appropriate. In fact, comparing equation (9) with equation (5), it is possible to see that time effects can properly capture comovement only if each global factor has the same effect across

---

[2]For an application of this methodology to the Feldstein - Horioka debate, see, for example, Ventura, 2002.

countries (i.e. $\delta_{i,j} = \delta_{i,h}$ for each j, h). Otherwise, the estimate of β remains inconsistent. Again, this specification doesn't take into account the possibility of heterogeneous transmission mechanisms of global shocks.

An other methodology consists in estimating the idiosyncratic component as the deviation of saving and investment from their OECD wide counterparts[3]. More precisely, this amounts to estimate the following panel regression:

$$\left(I_{j,t} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_j I_{j,t} \right) = \alpha_j + \beta \left(S_{j,t} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_j S_{j,t} \right) + \omega_{j,t} \tag{10}$$

where the $w_j's$ are cross section weights summing to 1. This methodology implicitly assumes that factor loadings are equal for each variable and country and, moreover, that global investment and saving are sufficient to capture the effects of global factors. If these assumptions are not satisfied the estimation of β is still inconsistent.

In conclusion, if global shocks propagate heterogeneously across countries, the relationship between idiosyncratic components of saving and investment cannot be consistently estimated by the regressions commonly used in Feldstein and Horioka type of analyses. However, equation (5) suggests that we can relax the homogeneity assumption by plugging directly the common factors into the baseline panel regression, without imposing any restriction on the country specific coefficients ($\delta_{i,j}, j = 1, \ldots, N, i = 1, \ldots, r$). The idea is to control for the factors that affect all countries, for example oil shocks or global productivity shocks, and, hence, could create imbalance on the world capital market. In addition, we could control for those variables that are mainly affected by global shocks and capture the closed economy constraint for the world economy, for example world investment and world interest rate. This approach is problematic since

---

[3]See Ostergaard, Sorensen and Yosha, 2002 for an application of this methodology to test for excess sensitivity in US states and Canada regions consumption.

global shocks or variables like the world interest rate are actually unobservable.

Our approach consists in extracting the global factors directly from saving and investment by cross country aggregation. In fact, since the idiosyncratic components are driven by non pervasive (country specific or regional) shocks, by worldwide aggregation they are averaged out and what survives are only the factors affecting saving and investment in all countries. More precisely, as shown by Forni et al., 2001 and Stock and Watson, 2002, the components of the factor model in (1) and (2) are identified and the unobserved global factors ($f_{i,t}, i = 1, \ldots, r$) can be estimated, provided that the number of countries under analysis is large. Hence, we plug estimated factors in equation (5), obtaining the following *factor augmented panel regression*:

$$I_{j,t} = \alpha_j + \beta S_{j,t} + \delta_{1,j} \hat{f}_{1,t} + \ldots + \delta_{r,j} \hat{f}_{r,t} + \varepsilon_{j,t} \tag{11}$$

In order to practically implement this methodology, we need to estimate r, the number of global factors and the global factors $f_{1,t}, \ldots, f_{r,t}$ themselves.

As for the estimation of the common factors, Forni and Reichlin, 1998 and Pesaran, 2002 have proposed to estimate them by means of cross country aggregates, such as the global investment ratio to GDP. As pointed out above, data aggregates converge to the common factors as the cross-sectional dimension increase, because the idiosyncratic components are averaged out. However, this approach may be problematic if there is more than one common factor. Stock and Watson, 2002 and Forni et al., 2001 have proposed to estimate the common factors, $f_{1,t} \ldots, f_{r,t}$, by means of the first r principal components. Consistency of this estimator is achieved as both the number of series and observations increase. These estimates are robust with respect to some form of non-stationarity in the data[4]. Moreover, if the number of countries is large relative to

---

[4]For time varying factor loadings and structural breaks see Stock and Watson, 2002 while for unit

the sample size, the estimated factors can be considered as known (Bai, 2003 and Bai and Ng, 2003) since there is no generated regressor problem (Pagan, 1984).

For what concerns the number of the common factors, r, there have been different proposals essentially based on the percentage of variance explained by each principal component. A rule of thumb proposed in Forni and Reichlin, 1998 suggests to retain only principal components that explain more than a certain threshold percentage of the panel variance. Bai and Ng, 2002 formalize this idea by constructing a criterion based on a data-dependent threshold[5].

3 Empirics

3.1 Global fluctuations

This section studies the features of the International Business Cycles focusing on their implications for the saving and investment debate. Our database consists in annual data on saving and investment ratios to GDP of 24 OECD countries for the period 1970 - 1999[6]. The extent of cross-country linkages can be measured by the correlation of domestic saving and investment with respect to their OECD wide counterpart. By regressing domestic saving and investment onto the global OECD investment ratio, we capture a remarkable 50% of the variance, on average[7]. An other option is to look at OECD wide aggregates that maximize the explainable variance. Principal components of the covariance matrix of the data have this property. In table 1, we show that the first principal component explains 55% of the variance of domestic saving and investment, on average. The second principal component also plays an important role

---

roots in the factors see Bai, 2004.

[5]This criterion is proved to consistently estimate the number of factors as both the time and cross-sectional dimension tend to infinity at any relative rate.

[6]More details on data sources can be found in the data appendix at the end of the paper.

[7]It is worth noticing that the difference between OECD wide saving and investment is insignificant since the OECD countries as a whole can be seen as a closed economy.

since it accounts for about 14% of the overall panel variance. Then, by means of two principal components, about 70% of the overall panel variance can be captured. The contribution of the other principal components in terms of explained panel variance is marginal. Consequently, the rule of thumb proposed by Forni and Reichlin, 1998 would suggest the existence of two common factors. On the other hand, the Bai and Ng, 2002 criterion proves inconclusive in our panel, probably because of the small sample. These results show that cross country linkages in saving and investment of OECD countries are strong. Following Forni et al. 2001 and Stock and Watson, 2002, we can conclude that the factor model representations (1) and (2) describe well our data.

Moreover, the global factors have also a strong long run effect on saving and investment of OECD countries: one aggregate accounts for more than 65% of the long run panel variance[8]. In addition, by looking at the percentage of the variance of domestic saving and investment explained by global factors, it is evident how their impact varies considerably across countries (see Figures 1 and 2). These findings are consistent with Kose, Otrok and Whiteman, 2003, who highlight both strong persistence and heterogeneity in the transmission mechanisms of global shocks. This suggests that, in order to properly control for general equilibrium effects, it is important to take into account that countries react with specific sign, magnitude and lag structure to global shocks.

As stressed in section 2, aggregates like those used above provide consistent estimates of the global factors for large sample size and cross section dimension. Given the existence of two global factors, a single aggregate like the OECD investment to GDP ratio is not sufficient to fully capture the effect of global shocks. Hence, the first two principal components are the most appropriate estimators.

---

[8]The aggregate we consider is the first principal component of the spectral density matrix at frequency zero. It is worth noting that the latter represents the covariance matrix of the sample mean.

On the other hand, principal components have an important drawback with respect to aggregates like, say, the global OECD saving or investment ratio: they miss a clear intuition. While well suited to assess the strength of cross country linkages and to estimate the factor space, in general they do not have an economic interpretation. In order to get an intuition on the nature of the principal components, we look at their relation with economic aggregates. In Figure 3, we plot the first principal component and the Global OECD investment ratio. These two aggregates are very similar and their correlation coefficient is 0.93. A good candidate for the second principal component should be a variable mainly driven by common shocks and not collinear with the global investment ratio. For example, the Global OECD Saving ratio is not appropriate because it satisfies the first but not the second requirement. The world interest rate, on the other hand, is a good candidate because, given its role in clearing the world capital market, it is expected to react to shocks that tend to create imbalances between world investment and saving. Unfortunately, a measure of the world interest rate is not available and its construction is problematic (see Barro, 1991). For this reason we use two proxies, the long run US interest rate and the average long run interest rate of the G7 countries. The correlation between the second principal component and US long run interest rate is 0.74 while, for the average of the G7 long run interest rates, it is 0.65. In Figure 4, we plot these variables against the second principal component. It is apparent how the two proxies of the world interest rate and the second principal component have similar dynamic behavior and, notably, they peak at the same time at the beginning of the $80's$. These results highlight the ability of our estimates of the common factors to capture the global forces driving prices and quantities in the world capital market.

3.2 Saving-Investment regressions

In this subsection, we present results on the Feldstein - Horioka puzzle. We analyze the whole sample $1970-1999$, the three subsamples $1970-1979, 1980-1989$ and $1990-1999$ and the subsample $1980-1999$ since we aim to study how the relation between saving and investment has been affected by the fast process of integration of financial and good markets in OECD countries. Our results are summarized in Table 2. In order to investigate the effects of misspecification of the number of global factors, we consider two different specifications for the factor augmented panel regression. The first with only one factor estimated by the Global OECD Investment to GDP ratio (Equation $11a$), the other with two common factors estimated by principal components (Equation $11b$).

Consider, first, results for the whole sample. It is evident that, once controlling for general equilibrium effects, the Feldstein - Horioka puzzle is de-emphasized. Both "long run" and "baseline panel" regressions further document the puzzle: the estimated saving - retention coefficient is high and significant. On the other hand, no matters how we control for global comovements, the coefficient is significantly reduced, even if it remains statistically different from zero. This is a clear evidence of the relevance of general equilibrium effects for explaining the correlation of saving and investment. However, if not properly taken into account, the heterogeneity of the transmission mechanism of global shocks biases upwards the estimated saving retention coefficient. In fact, in terms of point estimates, the coefficient is smaller for the factor augmented panel regressions (Equations $11a$ - b)[9]. The misspecification of the number of factors is

---

[9]Indeed, the homogeneity restriction $\delta_{i,j} = \delta_{i,h}$, $(i = 1, 2)$, for each country (j, h) in equation $11b$ is strongly rejected by the data (see Table 3).

another source of upward bias: the saving-retention coefficient estimated by controlling for one factor (Equation 11a) is higher than that estimated by controlling for two factors (Equation 11b). Notice that the high number of significant coefficients (δ's) on the second principal component in Equation 11b provides further evidence that the OECD wide investment ratio is not able, alone, to account for the effects of global shocks on saving and investment in OECD countries. On the other hand, by means of principal components we are able to fully capture the closed economy constraint on aggregate saving and investment without relying on specific unobservable variables such as the world interest rate. However, further research is needed to give a structural interpretation to our estimates of the global factors.

Results from subsamples allow us to analyze the evolution over time of the saving - retention coefficient[10]. From the baseline regression, the evolution over time of the estimated saving-retention coefficient appears to be characterized by a "u-shape": high in the 70's, it decreases in the 80's and increases again in the 90's. When controlling for global comovement, this "u-shape" tends to vanish. Furthermore, using the appropriate number of aggregates and taking heterogeneity of transmission mechanisms of global shocks into account, a clear break in the 80's appears: the saving - retention coefficient is high in the 70's and significantly drops in the 80's remaining stable in the 90's (Equation 11b). The analysis of the subsample $80 - 99$ further documents this finding. It is worth noticing that the temporal path in our estimates of the saving - retention coefficient is consistent with the widely documented evolution in the degree of international capital

---

[10]The common factors in equation 11 are computed by estimating the first two principal components in each subperiod under analysis. However, qualitative results do not change if we estimate factors on the whole sample. For instance, in the sample $80 - 99$ the saving - retention coefficient would be 0.15 instead of the 0.18 reported in the table. This is not surprising, given the robustness of principal components estimator to some forms of parameter instabilities (Stock and Watson, 2002).

mobility that was low during the 70's and has been steadily increasing since the early 80's.

Summing up, the empirical evidence suggests that, as originally claimed by Feldstein and Horioka in their seminal paper, the Intertemporal Theory of the Current Account failed to explain the relation between saving and investment before the 80's because of the low degree of capital mobility in OECD countries. From the 80's on, with the increased degree of international capital mobility, the relation between saving and investment has become closer to what predicted by the Intertemporal Theory of the Current Account. Given the partial equilibrium nature of this theory, if we do not isolate idiosyncratic sources of fluctuations taking heterogeneous responses of saving and investment to global shocks into account, this fact remains hidden.

4 Conclusions

This paper shows that, unlike what claimed by previous studies, general equilibrium effects can partly rationalize the high correlation between saving and investment observed in OECD countries. We develop a factor augmented panel regression that enables to isolate idiosyncratic sources of fluctuations. Contrary to existing studies, our approach allows for heterogeneous responses of saving and investment to global shocks. Empirical results show that the homogeneity restriction that is usually imposed biases upwards the estimated correlation between saving and investment. Relaxing this assumption we find that the correlation among saving and investment decreases over time becoming very small in the last two decades. This finding can be explained by the increased capital mobility in international financial markets.

Appendix 1: Data

The source of the data for this paper is OECD, National Accounts 1. Interest rates are in OECD, General Economic Problems. Data has annual frequency and ranges from 1970 to 1999.

Investment is Gross Capital Formation, in Main Aggregates/Table 4/Saving and net Lending - Borrowing.

Saving is the sum of Consumption of Fixed Capital and Net Saving, in Main Aggregates/Table 4/Saving and net Lending - Borrowing.

GDP is in Main Aggregates/Table 4/Disposable Income.

Long term Interest Rates of G7 countries are in OECD Economic Outlook Statistics and Projections/Financial Data.

Data refer to the following 24 countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, United Kingdom, Greece, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden, United States.

Bibliography

Bai J. (2004); "Etimating Cross-Section Common Stochastic Trends in Nonstationary Panel Data", *Journal of Econometrics*, forthcoming.

Bai J. (2003); "Inferential Theory for Factor Models of Large Dimensions", *Econometrica*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 135-171.

Bai J., Ng S. (2003); "Confidence Intervals for Diffusion Index Forecasts with a Large Number of Predictors", unpublished working paper.

Bai J., Ng S. (2002); "Determining the Number of Factors in Approximate Factor Models", *Econometrica*, Vol. 70, No. 1, pp. 191-221.

Barro R.J. (1991); "World Interest Rates and Investment", NBER Working Paper, No. 3849.

Forni M., Hallin M., Lippi M., Reichlin L. (2001); "The Generalized Factor model: Identification and Estimation", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 82, No. 3, pp. 540-554.

Forni M., Reichlin L. (1998); "Let's Get Real: a factor analytic approach to business cycle dynamics", *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 65, No. 3, pp 453-473.

Glick R., Rogoff K. (1995); "Global versus country-specific productivity shocks and the current account". *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 159-192.

Gregory A.W., Head A.C. (1999); "Common and country specific fluctuations in productivity, investment and the current account", *Journal of Monetary Economics*,

Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 423-451.

Kose A., Otrok C., Whiteman C.H. (2003); "International Business Cycles: World, Region and Country specific factors", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 93, No. 4, pp. 1216-1239.

Obstfeld M., Rogoff K. (2000); "The Six Major Puzzles in International Macroeconomics: is there a common Cause?", NBER Working Paper No. 7777.

Ostergaard C., Sorensen B., Yosha O. (2002); "Consumption and Aggregate Constraints: Evidence from US States and Canadian Provinces", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 111, No. 3, pp 634-645.

Pagan A. (1984); "Econometric Issues in the analysis of Regressions with Generated Regressors", *International Economic Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 221-247.

Pesaran M.H. (2002); "Estimation and Inference in Large Heterogenous Panels with Cross Section Dipendence", CESifo Working Paper Series, No. 869.

Stock J., Watson M. (2002); "Macroeconomic Forecasting using Diffusion Indexes", *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 147-162.

Ventura J. (2002); "Towards a Theory of Current account", NBER Working Paper No. 9163.

Table 1: **Share of the overall panel variance explained by static principal components.**

	1st	**2nd**	**3rd**	**4th**	**5th**
Marginal	0.5512	0.1415	0.0605	0.0577	0.0445
Cumulative	0.5512	0.6927	0.7532	0.8109	0.8554

Table 2: **Regression results**

	Sample				
Type of Regression	**70-99**	**70-79**	**80-89**	**90-99**	**80-99**
Long Run regression (Eq. 7)	**0.64** [0.10]	**0.57** [0.12]	**0.58** [0.09]	**0.61** [0.10]	**0.61** [0.09]
Baseline (Eq. 8)	**0.62** [0.03]	**0.57** [0.06]	**0.38** [0.07]	**0.53** [0.07]	**0.48** [0.04]
Time Effects (Eq. 9)	**0.45** [0.03]	**0.57** [0.06]	**0.35** [0.07]	**0.47** [0.07]	**0.41** [0.04]
Ostergaard et al. (Eq. 10)	**0.50** [0.03]	**0.58** [0.06]	**0.39** [0.06]	**0.63** [0.08]	**0.47** [0.04]
G.I. Ratio (Eq. 11a)	**0.42** [0.03]	**0.60** [0.07]	**0.32** [0.06]	**0.38** [0.07]	**0.35** [0.04]
2 Factors (Eq. 11b)	**0.34** [0.04]	**0.50** [0.10]	**0.21** [0.10]	**0.22** [0.11]	**0.18** [0.05]

Table 3: **Coefficients on the factors in equation (11b). Sample 70-99**

Country	1st Factor	2nd Factor
Australia	0.20*	0.21
Austria	0.36*	0.01
Belgium	0.34*	0.17
Canada	0.20*	0.16
Denmark	0.08	0.38*
Finland	0.63*	0.29
France	0.43*	0.07
Germany	0.15*	−0.30*
Greece	0.58*	−0.17
Iceland	0.66*	0.50*
Ireland	0.57*	1.11*
Italy	0.35*	0.33*
Japan	0.41*	−0.17
Korea	−0.16	−0.11
Mexico	0.06	0.28
Netherlands	0.35*	−0.32*
New Zealand	0.33*	0.43*
Norway	0.68*	0.34*
Portugal	0.03	0.81*
Spain	0.29*	−0.17
Sweden	0.32*	0.00
Switzerland	0.60*	−0.26*
UK	0.18*	−0.11*
USA	0.03	0.23
F-stat.	**8.39 (0.00)**	**5.42 (0.000)**
Chi Sq.-stat.	**192.90 (0.00)**	**124.60 (0.00)**

* Significant at 5% level.

The null hypothesis of the F and *Chi Square* tests reported in the last two rows of table 3 is

$$H_0 : \delta_{i,j} = \delta_{i,h} \text{ for each } j \text{ and } h$$

and the tests are conducted, separately,on the coefficients of both factors estimated from equation 11b.

Figure 1: **Domestic Saving. Percentage of variance explained by the first two factors.**


Figure 2: **Domestic Investment. Percentage of variance explained by the first two factors.**

Figure 3: **First Principal Component**

Figure 4: **Second Principal Component**