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Abstract

Three causality tests, Haugh, Granger and Sims are used to determine the nature of causal relationship between the components of monetary base of India, Malaysia, Mexico and Taiwan. The conclusion derived is that bidirectional causality exists between the changes in domestic credit and changes in international reserves for all four countries.
Recently, Blejer (1979) tested the direction of causality between domestic credit and international reserve components of several developed countries monetary base. The objective was to establish support for one of the basic tenets of the monetary approach to the balance of payments (MBoP), that an exogenous expansion of domestic credit leads to an endogenous outflow of foreign exchange reserves. His results supported the direction of causality running from domestic credit to international reserves. However, Blejer's analysis suffered from many shortcomings. First, he used only one test of causality, namely, Sims (1972), when in fact, there are three such tests available. Second, his estimation method failed to take account of problems associated with potential serial autocorrelation in the residuals of the Sims regressions. This could easily have biased the results. Third, since contemporaneous coefficients for all countries he studied were significant, it is not clear whether the relationship between domestic credit and international reserves is mainly contemporaneous. Lastly, in order to ascertain the true direction of causation, it is advisable to use as much disaggregated data series as are available because of possible bias introduced by aggregation. Keeping this in view, it would have been more appropriate for Blejer to have used monthly rather than quarterly data series. Feige and Johannes (1981) retested the MBoP for six countries taking into account the above noted
drawbacks in Blejer's work. Their sample was, however, restricted to the developed nations, so in this paper the nature of relationship between the components of the monetary base is studied for four developing countries, India, Malaysia, Mexico and Taiwan. The widest range of techniques available are employed on monthly data series.

The MBoP has been widely tested on data from several developing countries and the IMF bases its financial programme and policy recommendations for the member countries on principles that are consistent with it. The empirical results were construed to support the MBoP when negative correlation between domestic and foreign assets was detected. But this does not provide evidence in support of the proposition that causality does indeed run from domestic to foreign assets. Empirical determination of the direction of causality requires implementation of tests geared to testing for causation. Such empirical analysis is important not only because it throws further light on the central proposition of the MBoP, but also because it could assist the national and international policy makers.

The paper is organised as follows. In the next section, the domestic and foreign asset relationship embodied in the MBoP is stated. Sections III and IV present the causality tests and the results, respectively. The concluding comments are given in the last section.

For instance, see Kreinin and Officer (1978) for a survey and Aghevli and Khan (1977).

II The MBoP

The commonly empirically studied reserve-flow equation of MBoP is the following reduced-form version.

\[
\frac{R}{R + D} \Delta \log R = \Delta \log P + \alpha \Delta \log y - \beta \Delta \log i - \Delta \log m - \frac{D}{R + D} \Delta \log D
\]  

(1)

where \( R \) is the level of the country's international reserves; \( D \) is the domestic component of the monetary base; \( P \) is the domestic price level; \( y \) is real income; \( i \) is the interest rate; and \( m \) is the domestic money multiplier. According to (1), expansion of domestic credit in excess of domestic demand for nominal balances will result in a balance of payments deficit as the public gets rid of the excess supply of money by raising its expenditure over income. Therefore, the direction of causality suggested by (1) is from domestic credit to foreign reserves.

However, it is conceivable that the causality may run from foreign reserves to domestic credit (Blejer (1979)). This is likely when central banks actively sterilize the impact of exogenous changes in foreign reserves on the domestic money supply. It could also exist when commercial banks in order to prevent fluctuations in domestic credit volume borrow from the central bank when confronted with a loss of reserves through an outflow of international reserves.

III Causality Tests

We employ three commonly used tests of causality, Granger (1969), Haugh (1976) and Sims (1972). We do not discuss the theory underlying these tests as it has been well documented elsewhere. Only a brief description of the tests is presented.

\footnote{For instance, see Feige and Pearce (1979) and Feige and Johannes (1981).}
In Haugh test, prewhitened data series are cross correlated and two statistics, $S$ and $S^*$ are computed. The statistic $S$ is defined as

$$S = \sum_{k=-m}^{m} \hat{r}^2(k)$$

where $N$ is the number of observations, $k$ is the number of leads or lags and $\hat{r}$ are the cross-correlations for $k$ leads and lags.

When $k$ is large relative to the number of observations, then $S^*$ is estimated.

$$S^* = \sum_{k=-m}^{m} \frac{\hat{r}^2}{(N - |k|)}$$

Under the null hypothesis of independence, $S$ and $S^*$ are asymptotically distributed as chi-square with $2m+1$ degrees of freedom.

Since Haugh test is strictly valid only as a test of independence or dependence between series, Granger and Sims causality tests are needed to determine the direction of causation. The Granger procedure consists of estimating two regressions.

$$\Delta D_t = \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k \Delta D_{t-k} + \sum_{j=0}^{n} b_j \Delta R_{t-j} + \epsilon_t$$

$$\Delta R_t = \sum_{k=1}^{m} c_k \Delta R_{t-k} + \sum_{j=0}^{n} d_j \Delta D_{t-j} + \zeta_t$$

For $\Delta R$ not to cause $\Delta D$, all $b_j$ for $j > 0$ must be zero, while for $\Delta R$ not to cause $\Delta D$ at all, all $b_j$ for $j \geq 0$ must be zero.
For $\Delta D$ not to cause $\Delta R$, all $d_j$ for $j \geq 0$ must be zero. $\Delta D$ does not cause $\Delta R$ at all, if all $d_j$ for $j \geq 0$ equal zero.

The Sims test is based on the regressions

\begin{align}
\Delta D_t &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i \cdot \Delta R_{t-i} + e_t \tag{6}
\Delta R_t &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_i \cdot \Delta D_{t-i} + f_t \tag{7}
\end{align}

$\Delta D$ does not cause $\Delta R$, if $p_i$ for $i \leq 0$ equals zero and $\Delta D$ does not cause $\Delta R$ at all if $p_i$ for $i \leq 0$ are all zero. Analogously, $\Delta R$ does not cause $\Delta D$, if $q_i$ for $i \leq 0$ are all zero, while $\Delta R$ does not cause $\Delta D$ at all, if $q_i$ for $i \leq 0$ are all zero.

IV Data and Empirical Results

The causality tests have been carried out on monthly seasonally unadjusted changes in the domestic credit and reserve components of the monetary base in India, Malásia, Mexico and Taiwan. The period ranges from March 1963 to July 1971 for all countries with the exception of Malaysia and Mexico. The series for Malaysia commence from April 1966 and that of Mexico end in November 1970. The data have been

---

4 The period of study has been determined by the availability of data and by the fact that the exchange rates were fixed during this period.
obtained from several editions of the *International Financial Statistics* (IFS). These countries were selected because empirical evidence in favour of MBoP already exists for them (Aghevli and Khan (1977)). Secondly, these countries represent varying degrees of openness to world trade. Malaysia and Taiwan are the most open of these economies, with Mexico being moderately open, and India being the least open. The degree of openness is relevant because MBoP is applicable more to open economies.

The estimated autocorrelation functions for the components of monetary base of Malaysia and Taiwan indicated that no prefiltering was required. However, ARIMA filters were judged to be necessary for Indian and Mexican series (presented in Table 1). The $S$ and $S^*$ for each country (Table 2) suggested that the null hypothesis that $\Delta D$ and $\Delta R$ are independent can be rejected at 0.05 or 0.10 level of significance. Except for

5 Reserves are taken to be official international reserves (line 1, IFS) converted to domestic currency units. Domestic credit is defined as the monetary base (line 14, IFS) minus reserves.

6 In fact, their results for the chosen countries suggested a strong support for the MBoP.
Mexico, S and S* are significant (in Table 2) for all leads and lags of up to 12. For Mexico, dependence is observed only at the short lags. These results, therefore, indicate that dependence exists between ΔR and ΔD for all four countries.

The Granger and Sims regressions were run to determine the nature of the relationship between the components of monetary base. The Granger regressions (4) and (5) contained a constant and a trend in addition to other variables. Since seasonality was observed in the Indian and Mexican data series, monthly dummies were introduced to account for the seasonal patterns.

The values for m and n were set equal to twelve for the countries studied. The Granger F statistics are reported in Tables 3 and 4. In Table 3, the null hypotheses that $b_j=0$, for $j>0$ and $d_j=0$, for $j>0$ are examined. The F statistics are significant at .05 or .10 level in both cases for all countries, implying that causality is bidirectional between ΔR and ΔD.

---

6 The regression for India also contained a dummy for devaluation of the rupee in June 1966.

7 The same lag lengths have been examined by Blejer (1979) for the Sims test and by Feige and Johannes (1981) for the Granger and Sims.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Diagnostic Check on Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Dom. Credit</td>
<td>$(1-B^12)(1-0.21B^12)\Delta D = U_D$</td>
<td>$Q = 27.84$ d.f = 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intern. Res.</td>
<td>$(1-0.19B^2-0.34B^5)\Delta R = U_R$</td>
<td>$Q = 30.53$ d.f = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Dom. Credit</td>
<td>$(1-B^12)\Delta D = (1-0.57B^12)U_D$</td>
<td>$Q = 20.86$ d.f = 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The t values are given in parentheses under each coefficient.

(a) For Malaysia and Taiwan both the $\Delta D$ and $\Delta R$ series were white noise.

(b) Since the first differences for International Reserves were found to be white noise, no filter was required.
TABLE 2  Haugh Test Results

| Country | $|K|= 1$ | $|K|= 6$ | $|K|= 12$ | $|K|= 24$ |
|---------|-------|--------|---------|--------|
| Malaysia |      |        |         |        |
| S       | 31.64* | 40.68* | 44.86*  | 57.91  |
| S*      | 31.65* | 41.19* | 46.09*  | 64.675*|
| Taiwan  |      |        |         |        |
| S       | 36.38* | 44.16* | 49.42*  | 77.99* |
| S*      | 36.39* | 44.54* | 50.63*  | 85.42* |
| Mexico  |      |        |         |        |
| S       | 8.37*  | 14.73  | 29.64   | 48.57  |
| S*      | 8.40*  | 15.17  | 33.03   | 58.64  |
| India   |      |        |         |        |
| S       | 25.10* | 29.07* | 37.55*  | 51.06  |
| S*      | 25.15* | 29.34* | 39.13*  | 56.67  |

+ Significant at 0.10 level.
* Significant at 0.05 level.

TABLE 3  Granger F Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>$p_j= 0, j\geq0$</th>
<th>$d_j= 0, j\geq0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3.38*(13,24)</td>
<td>3.16*(13,24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>5.15*(13,61)</td>
<td>3.59*(13,61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3.98*(13,42)</td>
<td>2.8* (13,42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1.85* (13,49)</td>
<td>3.19* (13,49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level. Degrees of freedom in parentheses.
+ Significant at the 0.10 level. Degrees of freedom in parentheses.
The contemporaneous coefficients (included in tests in Table 3) were significant in all Granger regressions. Hence, it cannot be ascertained whether the relationship between \( \Delta D \) and \( \Delta R \) is mainly contemporaneous in nature. In Table 4, therefore the F-statistics were computed by excluding the contemporaneous coefficients. The results show that causality runs unidirectionally from international reserves to domestic credit for Taiwan, and from domestic credit to international reserves for India. However, for Malaysia while no causality in either direction is observed, in case of Mexico the relationship is bidirectional. If these relationships held instantaneously, then it would seem that in Taiwan, there is either a sterilisation of changes in international reserves or borrowing by the commercial banks of the nature discussed earlier. In Mexico, the relationship appears to be bidirectional. However, in India, an exogenous change in domestic credit causes a change in international reserves. Because it is not possible to empirically determine the direction of causality contained in a contemporaneous relationship, the conservative result then is that domestic/reserve relationship is bidirectional for the four countries.

The Sims regressions (6) and (7) were estimated using Hannan efficient estimation procedure recommended by Sims (1974) to overcome the problem of serial correlation in the residuals. The results displayed in Table 5 test the hypotheses
that all \( q_i = 0 \), for \( i \leq 0 \) and all \( p_i = 0 \), for \( i \leq 0 \). Since all the F statistics are significant, we can reject the null hypotheses that there is no causality at all running from \( \Delta R \) to \( \Delta D \) and \( \Delta D \) to \( \Delta R \).

All contemporaneous coefficients in Sims regressions were found to be significant. When these coefficients are excluded (Table 6), the results for Malaysia and Mexico are similar to those of Granger* test. In Taiwan and India, however, bidirectional causality is observed.

The conclusions that follow from these tests are (see Table 7): First, the Granger and the Sims tests indicate bidirectional relationship between domestic credit and international reserves for all four countries. Second, in all cases, there is a strong contemporaneous relationship between \( \Delta D \) and \( \Delta R \). Third, exclusion of contemporaneous coefficients (Granger* and Sims*) show no causality for Malaysia and bidirectional for Mexico. However, Granger* and Sims* give conflicting results for India and Taiwan.
### Table 4: Granger* F Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>$d_1 = 0, \geq 0$</th>
<th>$d_2 = 0, \geq 0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0.67 (12,24)</td>
<td>0.29 (12,24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1.84* (12,61)</td>
<td>0.87 (12,61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2.31* (12,42)</td>
<td>1.70* (12,42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1.20 (12,49)</td>
<td>1.77* (12,49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.10 level. Degrees of freedom in parentheses.

Note: Granger* excludes the contemporaneous coefficients.

### Table 5: Sims F Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>$q_1 = 0, 1 \leq 0$</th>
<th>$p_1 = 0, 1 \leq 0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>5.70* (13,12)</td>
<td>8.06* (13,12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>13.56* (13,50)</td>
<td>17.22* (13,50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.94* (13,42)</td>
<td>7.43* (13,42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5.84* (13,49)</td>
<td>4.64* (13,49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.10 level. Degrees of freedom in parentheses.

### Table 6: Sims* F Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>$q_1 = 0, 1 \leq 0$</th>
<th>$p_1 = 0, 1 \leq 0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.74 (12,12)</td>
<td>1.40 (12,12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>9.95* (12,50)</td>
<td>8.20* (12,50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>5.23* (12,42)</td>
<td>3.04* (12,42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2.53* (12,49)</td>
<td>3.02* (12,49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.10 level. Degrees of freedom in parentheses.

Note: Sims* excludes the contemporaneous coefficient.

### Table 7: Comparison of the Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Haugh</th>
<th>Granger</th>
<th>Granger*</th>
<th>Sims</th>
<th>Sims*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta - \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta - \Delta R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
<td>$\Delta \leftrightarrow \Delta R$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V Concluding Comment

In this paper, the nature of domestic credit/reserve relationship embodied in the MBoP approach was studied on four developing countries, India, Malaysia, Mexico and Taiwan. The results indicate that when instantaneous effects are also considered, the relationship between $\Delta D$ and $\Delta R$ for all countries is bidirectional. This type of relationship is fully consistent with the MBoP (Blejer (1979)). The sterilization and commercial bank scenarios could interact simultaneously with the direction of causality suggested by the MBoP to yield a bidirectional relationship.

Since it is uncertain whether the bidirectional causality is on account of the strong instantaneous effect, the contemporaneous coefficients were excluded in the next run of tests. The results from these tests (Granger* and Sims*) were not consistent across all countries. Only for two countries, definite conclusions could be derived. In Malaysia, for instance, the relationship between $\Delta R$ and $\Delta D$ appears to be essentially contemporaneous. A bidirectional causality is, however, observed for Mexico. The tests failed to resolve the nature of the non-instantaneous relationship in cases of India and Taiwan.

The results of this paper should aid the domestic and international policy makers. In addition, they throw further
light on the role of international reserves in attaining
domestic monetary equilibrium, which is the central propo-
sition of the MBoP.
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