Analysis of the Relationship between Commodity Futures and Spot Prices An Applied Time Series Analysis (Stationarity, Cointegration, Granger-Causality)

Georg Valentin Lehecka

January, 2012

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Table of Content

- 1 Introduction: Futures and Spot Prices
- 2 Description of Data
- **3** Tests on Stationarity
- 4 Tests on Cointegration
- 5 Tests on Granger-Causality
- 6 Summary and Conclusion

Introduction

Aims of this empirical analysis

- Examination of stationarity of daily commodity futures and spot prices
- Examination of cointegration relationships of daily commodity futures and spot prices
- Examination of Granger-cause relationships of daily commodity futures and spot prices

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Spot Prices

The spot price of a commodity is the price that is quoted for immediate (spot) settlement (payment and delivery).

Futures Prices

The futures price of a commodity is the price that is quoted for a certain delivery time and a certain amount in the future.

- 4 回 ト 4 ヨ ト 4 ヨ ト

Introduction: Spot Prices

SJ_GR850 ***Date change on Year*** St. Joseph, MO Wed Jan 04, 2012 USDA-MO Dept Ag Market News

Daily National Grain Market Summary

Grains closed slightly mixed after Tuesday's active trade. Corn closed mostly unchanged as it rallied late to close off its losses, as dry conditions in Argentina has curbed selling interest. Soybeans had slight gains as soybeans are also tied to the dry conditions in South America. Wheat had losses in Chicago and Minneapolie, with slight gains in K.C. Wheat closed slightly mixed. Corn traded steady to 3 cents higher. Soybeans closed 2-12 cents higher.

	DATE	CHANGE	YEAR AGO
TRUCK BIDS:	01/04/12***	01/03/12***	01/05/11***
Wheat:			
Kansas City (HRW ORD)	6.89	up 1	7.98
Minneapolis (DNS)	8.94	dn 5 1/4	9.29
Portland (SWW)	6.05-6.25	dn 5	7.60-7.70
St. Louis (SRW)	6.63	dn 3	8.02
Corn, US No 2 Yellow:			
Kansas City	6.77	up 3	6.01-6.04
Minneapolis	No Bid	N/A	No Bid
So. Iowa	6.37 1/2-6.43 1/2	unch	5.93 1/4-5.97 1/4
Omaha	6.47-6.50	unch	5.91-5.95
Soybeans, US No 1 Yellow	v :		
Kansas City	12.20	up 12	13.55-13.59
Minneapolis	No Bid	N/A	No Bid
So. Iowa	11.99-12.02	up 2 1/2	13.57-13.71 1/2
Cent. Il Processor	12.20-12.25	up 12 1/2-2 1/2	13.71 1/2-13.86 1/2

Georg Valentin Lehecka Relationship between Commodity Futures and Spot Prices

イロン イ部ン イヨン イヨン 三日

Introduction: Futures Prices

CME G	Group		Electronic Trading Clearing CME DisarPort Market Data Services Market Regulation Education Resources										
Agriculture Energ	gy Equity Index	FX I Interes	t Rates 1	Metals OT	C Real	Estate V	Veather				Searc	h CMEGroup.com	•
ME Group » Agriculture »	Com												
	Agricultura	al Products	3						ЩĨ	REGL	JLATORY		
	View an Agric	ultural Product	2000	Mark States		Contraction of	ALC: NO.	A NAME OF	M	ARBI	TRAGE		
	Select and ge	0	•	and the	-	1	Sec. 1	N. C. S. T.	٤	READ STOR	IY ON OPEN MARKETS ->		
	Corn Futu	res											
	Quotes Contra	act Specificatio	ns Perfor	mance Bond	ds / Margin	s Produc	t Calendar	Learn Mo	ore		- P		
										Tree	da Data: 4/E/2012		
	Quotes III	ne & Sales	Volume Futures	Settlement	ts			N	larket Data i	s delayed at	t least 10 minutes		
								Turn Aut	to-refresh	OFF	About this Report		
	Month	Charts	Last	Change	Prior Settle	Open	High	Low	Volume	Hi / Lo Limit	Updated		
	Mar 2012		649'2	-9'2	658'4	658'0	659'6	645'6	84,871	698'4 618'4	10:29:46 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	May 2012		656%	-10'0	666'6	666'2	668'0	653'4	34,141	706'6 626'6	10:29:47 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	Jul 2012		662'6	-10'2	673'0	671'6	674'0	659'2	27,427	713'0 633'0	10:29:44 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	Sep 2012		609'4	-8'2	617'6	616'4	617'4	606'0	1,409	657'6 577'6	10:29:47 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	Dec 2012		583'4	-6'2	589'6	589'0	589'6	580'4	10,375	629'6 549'6	10:29:46 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	Mar 2013		595'0	-6'6	601'6	600'0	601'4	594'0	206	641'6 561'6	10:25:24 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	May 2013		603'2	-6'0	609'2	608'4	608'4	603'0	16	649'2 569'2	9:46:53 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	Jul 2013		607'0	-6'6	613'6	609'4	609'4	606'6 a	42	653'6 573'6	10:24:56 AM CT 1/5/2012		
	Sep 2013		1.1	-	589'0	-	-	-	0	629'0 549'0	9:30:00 AM CT 1/5/2012		

Georg Valentin Lehecka

Relationship between Commodity Futures and Spot Prices

3

Abard J. Comerce J. Januaries Deletions, J. Madia Beam, J. M. Faedback, J. Olivius

Commodity	Exchange	Time Period	Data Points
Lean hog	CBOT	1995-11-02 to 2011-12-30	4065
Feeder cattle	СВОТ	2001-01-02 to 2011-12-30	2763
Kansas wheat	KCBOT	2002-01-02 to 2011-12-30	2468
Minneapolis wheat	MGE	2002-01-02 to 2011-12-30	2465
Crude oil	NYME	1986-01-02 to 2011-12-30	6514
Heating oil	NYME	1986-06-02 to 2011-12-30	6406

- Futures prices are obtained from the particular exchange (data of the next-to-delivery contract month, respectively).
- Spot prices are obtained from USDA (grains), CME (meats), and U.S. EIA (energy) reports, respectively.

イロン イ部ン イヨン イヨン 三日

Description of Data



Georg Valentin Lehecka

Relationship between Commodity Futures and Spot Prices

ADF Test

$$\Delta X_t = a + bt + \phi X_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \alpha_j \Delta X_{t-j} + u_t$$

 $H_0: \phi = 0 <=>$ unit root in the characteristic polynomial => nonstationarity

 $H_1: \phi < 0 \ll no$ unit root in the characteristic polynomial => (trend) stationarity.

The lag order p is determined by minimizing AIC for autoregressions with a constant and a linear trend. X_t are logarithms of the nominal price series.

(ロ) (同) (E) (E) (E)

Commodity	Series	ADF	ADF-I(1)	Lags	Implication	
Lean hog	Spot	-3.87**	-23.87***	3	I(0)	
	Futures	-3.69**	-61.19***	1	I(0)	
Foodor cattle	Spot	-1.90	-17.38***	10	I(1)	
Feeder Cattle	Futures	-2.23	-47.43***	1	I(1)	
Kansas wheat	Spot	-2.33	-50.68***	0	I(1)	
	Futures	-2.21	-48.56***	0	I(1)	
Minneapolis wheat	Spot	-1.94	-48.87***	0	I(1)	
	Futures	-2.01	-48.13***	0	I(1)	
Crude oil	Spot	-3.29*	-39.20***	5	I(1)	
	Futures	-3.42**	-81.41***	0	I(0)	
Heating oil	Spot	-2.76	-43.18***	4	I(1)	
	Futures	-2.70	-80.18***	0	I(1)	

ADE tost results

Note: Single (*), double (**), and triple asterisks (***) denote significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively $_{\oplus}$, $_{\oplus}$,

Georg Valentin Lehecka Relationship between Commodity Futures and Spot Prices

Johansen Procedure (Multivariate DF Model)

If the re-written vector representation

$$\Delta X_{t} = \mu + \Pi X_{t-1} + \Psi_{1} \Delta X_{t-1} + \Psi_{2} \Delta X_{t-2} + \dots + \Psi_{p-1} \Delta X_{t-p+1} + u_{t}$$

with $X = (X_1, ..., X_n)'$ is cointegrated, then Π is singular and can be represented as

$$\Pi = \alpha \beta',$$

with $(n \times r)$ -matrices α , β of rank r. The r columns of β are cointegrating vectors that describe equilibrium relations. The coefficients in α are called loading coefficients and describe how the variables react to deviations from equilibrium.

(D) < 2 > < 2 >

The Johansen procedure step by step:

- **1** All variables X_j , j = 1, ..., n should be either I(1) or I(0).
- 2 Determine the VAR lag order *p* by multivariate information criteria.
- Determine the cointegrating rank r by sequences of hypothesis tests: estimate β.
- 4 Estimate the full EC-VAR model given p and r to estimate α and Ψ_j.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Cointegration test results

Commodity	$r \leq 1$	<i>r</i> = 0	Lags	Implication
Lean hog	11.79***	109.56***	12	system is stationary
Feeder cattle	2.00	27.31***	23	cointegration $r = 1$
Kansas wheat	2.60	12.36	2	no cointegration
Minneapolis wheat	2.65	19.11**	12	cointegration $r = 1$
Crude oil	0.88	105.90***	22	cointegration $r = 1$
Heating oil	0.98	82.54***	22	cointegration $r = 1$

Note: Single (*), double (**), and triple asterisks (***) denote significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively. The standard model with a constant is used. The VAR lag order is determined by minimizing multivariate AIC. X_t are logarithms of nominal price series.

向下 イヨト イヨト

For example **feeder cattle** spot and futures prices cointegrate (the rank r=1) and the system can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta \mathsf{Spot}_t \\ \Delta \mathsf{Futures}_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0103 \\ -0.0018 \end{bmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} -0.0906 \\ 0.0174 \end{bmatrix}}_{\alpha} \underbrace{[1, -0.98]}_{\beta'} \begin{bmatrix} \mathsf{Spot}_{t-1} \\ \mathsf{Futures}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ + \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{12} & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \mathsf{Spot}_{t-1} \\ \Delta \mathsf{Futures}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \dots + \begin{bmatrix} u_{1,t} \\ u_{2,t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

伺 とう きょう とう とう

In the case of two time series, X_1 and X_2 , X_1 Granger-cause X_2 if X_2 can be better predicted using the histories of both X_1 and X_2 than it can by using the histories of X_2 alone.

Granger-Causality Test

 $X_{2,t}$ is not Granger-causal for $X_{1,t}$ iif the bivariate VAR(p) process of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{1,t} \\ X_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_{11,i} & \gamma_{12,i} \\ \gamma_{12,i} & \gamma_{22,i} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_{1,t-i} \\ X_{2,t-i} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} u_{1,t} \\ u_{2,t} \end{bmatrix}$$

has $\gamma_{12,i} = 0$, for all i = 1, 2, ..., p.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Notes on Granger-causality tests:

- It requires checking whether specific coefficients are zero, therefore standard tests for zero restrictions are applied (χ^2 or *F*-test based on the Wald principle).
- They have nonstandard asymptotic properties if the VAR contains l(m) variables with m > 0 (or possible cointegration).
- This can be overcome in fitting VAR processes whose order exceeds the true order.
- A lag augmented model with *m* additional lags can be used in the test.
- The hypothesis of zero coefficients has to be tested on only the first p coefficients.

See Toda and Yamamoto (1995) for more details.

Commodity	Spot → Futures	Futures → Spot			
	p-values				
Lean hog	0.01***	0.00***			
Feeder cattle	0.00***	0.00***			
Kansas wheat	0.73	0.00***			
Minneapolis wheat	0.00***	0.00***			
Crude oil	0.00***	0.00***			
Heating oil	0.00***	0.00***			

Granger causality test results

Note: Single (*), double (**), and triple asterisks (***) denote significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively. A VAR model with a constant is used. The same lag orders as in cointegration tests are used. m (the maximum order of integration of both time series) additional lags are included. Logarithms of nominal price series are used.

Implications of Granger-causality test results:

- Granger-causality between commodity spot and futures prices appears generally to be bi-directional. Futures prices cause spot prices and vice versa.
- This suggests that no profitable arbitrage exists, new information appears to be reflected by spot and futures prices simultaneously.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

Summary and Conclusion

Test Results

- Stationarity: Unit roots tests suggest that daily commodity spot and futures prices appear generally to be non-stationary.
- Cointegration: Tests on cointegration suggest that daily commodity spot and futures prices appear generally to be cointegrated.
- Granger-causality: Tests on Granger-causality suggest generally bi-directional causality between daily commodity spot and futures prices.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

- Lütkepohl, H. and Krätzig, M. (eds.) (2004). Applied Time Series Econometrics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Toda, H. Y. and Yamamoto, T. (1995). Statistical inference in vector autoregressions with possibly integrated processes. Journal of Econometrics, 66, 225–250.

伺 ト イヨト イヨト