

## COMMENTARY

### Is Money Endogenous in the Pacific Island Countries?

T.K. Jayaraman and Chee-Keong Choong  
*University of the South Pacific, FIJI ISLANDS*  
*Universitiy Tunku Abdul Rahman, MALAYSIA*

#### Introduction

Successful conduct of monetary policy and its implementation depends on a stable relationship between money supply and monetary base. The assumption behind this relationship is that monetary base, also known as reserve money, is exogenous. In other words, the causal relationship is assumed to run from monetary base to money. This assumption was investigated by Goodhart (1984, 1994) and Howells and Hussein (1998) in the advanced countries and by McClean (1981, 1985, 1997, 1998) and Greenidge et al (2001) in the developing countries including Caribbean island countries. The empirical studies on the G-7 countries (Howells and Hussein 1998), which have flexible exchange rate regimes, established that money was endogenous. On the other hand, the results obtained from studies in the Caribbean region were mixed (Greenidge et al 2001).

In open economies with fixed exchange rate regimes, the central bank ends up in times of balance of payments surplus purchasing foreign exchange from exporters at the fixed exchange rate, which increases international reserves and also the monetary base by the same amount. When there is a deficit in the balance of payments, the central bank sells foreign exchange at a fixed exchange rate and in the process reduces its international reserves and monetary base by the same amount. Thus, monetary authorities have

no discretion to change the monetary base at will, thus rendering it as an endogenous variable. The implication is that with fixed exchange rates, domestic monetary authorities cannot control their own money supplies (Pierce and Tysome 1985, 36).

McClellan (1998, 1985) concluded that narrow money in Barbados had a causal predominance over reserve money and therefore, monetary base in an open economy could be endogenous. Greenidge et al. (2001), however cautioned that such a conclusion could not be generalised for all the open island economies in the Caribbean region. Jayaraman and Ward (2003) in their study on Fiji, a Pacific Island country (PIC) with an open economy under a fixed exchange rate regime, observed that there was a two-way causal relationship between Fiji's monetary aggregate and monetary base.

The objective of this commentary is to examine whether any generalisation could be made in respect of all six Pacific island countries, which have their own independent currencies. The countries chosen are Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu, all of which have fixed exchange rate regimes; and Papua New Guinea (PNG), which has adopted a flexible exchange regime since 1994. There are no studies on Pacific islands on the lines of a regional study similar to Greenidge et al (2001). The only study available is on Fiji (Jayaraman and Ward 2003), which is related to an earlier period 1980-2001. In the present study, a more recent period for all the relevant countries, including Fiji is covered. The remainder of the article is organised as follows: the second section outlines the methodology adopted for the empirical analysis, the third section reports the results and the third and last section presents a summary and conclusions.

### **Data and Methodology**

The variables for the econometric analysis include narrow money (M1) representing currency and checking deposits; broad money (M2) representing M1 plus savings and time deposits and reserve money (RM) consisting of currency held outside the banks and reserves kept by commercial banks with the monetary authority.

The period of analysis varies in respect of each country as dictated by availability of data, which are drawn from IMF (2008). For Fiji, PNG,

Samoa and Solomon Islands the period covered is 1980 to 2007; for Tonga the period covered is 1983 to 2007 and for Vanuatu 1981 to 2007. The number of quarterly observations for the data series of Fiji, PNG, Samoa and Solomon Islands is 112; the number of quarterly observations for data series for Tonga is 74; and Vanuatu is 106. The variables were transformed into logs for the empirical analysis for checking unit roots and testing the presence of a long-term relationship or cointegration between the monetary aggregates and reserve money.

The equation reflecting the long-term relationship to be estimated is:

$$LM_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LRM_t + e_t \quad (1)$$

where

$LM$  = log of  $M1$  or log  $M2$ , as the case may be;

$LRM$  = log of reserve money;

$e$  is the Gaussian error term; and

$t$  = time period

In order to examine the endogeneity of money in six PICs, the study uses a few econometric techniques, namely Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) and Ng-Perron unit root tests, the Johansen and Juselius (JJ) cointegration procedure, and Granger's causality test within vector error correction model (VECM). ADF and Ng-Perron tests are used to examine the order of integration of each time series. The cointegration test is applied to examine the long-run relationships between monetary aggregates and reserve money, while the Granger causality test is aimed to investigate the short-run dynamic causal relationship between them.

### Cointegration Test

When monetary aggregates and reserve money become stationary after first differencing (that is, integrated of order one), they may have linear combinations and cointegrated in the long-run (Granger, 1981). The next step is to apply cointegration techniques to examine whether there appears a long-run stable relationship between monetary aggregates and reserve money. In this analysis, we use the JJ (Johansen and Juselius 1990) framework of testing



for the existence of cointegrating vector. The JJ cointegration procedure applies a system approach to cointegration that enables determination of up to  $r$  linearly independent cointegrating vectors ( $r \leq m-1$ ), where  $m$  is the set of variables used for cointegration. The cointegration equation is constructed as follows:

$$\Delta Z_t = \Pi Z_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i \Delta Z_{t-i} + BX_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

$$\text{where } \Pi = \sum_{i=1}^p A_i - I, \Gamma_i = \sum_{j=i+1}^p A_j, Z_t$$

is a  $k$ -vector of  $I(1)$  variables,  $X_t$  is a  $d$ -vector of deterministic variables, and  $\varepsilon_t$  is vector of white noises with zero mean and finite variance. The cointegrating equations are reflected by the rank of the coefficient matrix  $\Pi$ . This cointegration technique is to estimate the  $\Pi$  matrix in an unrestricted model, then test the restrictions implied by the reduced rank of  $\Pi$ .

In order to examine the number of cointegrating vectors, the JJ cointegration technique provides two types of likelihood ratio tests. The first test is based on the trace test and the second test is based on the maximum eigenvalue test. We use both test statistics to examine the long-run relationship between monetary aggregates and reserve money.

### Granger Causality Test

Engle and Granger (1987) demonstrate that once variables are found to be cointegrated, there should be a corresponding error-correction representation in which the short-run dynamics of the variables in the system are influenced by deviations from equilibrium. Accordingly, it is implied that changes in the dependent variables are a function of the level of disequilibrium in the cointegrated relationship (captured by the error-correction term), as well as, changes in other explanatory variable(s).

Given that M1 and RM are cointegrated, the Granger representation theorem suggests that the dynamic relation between these variables should be

examined within the framework of vector error correction model (VECM), and the system of the short-run dynamics of M and RM is:

$$\Delta LM_t = \gamma_1 ECT_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{1i} \Delta LM_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{2i} \Delta LRM_{t-i} + \mu_{1t} \quad (3)$$

$$\Delta LRM_t = \gamma_2 ECT_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_{1i} \Delta LM_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_{2i} \Delta LRM_{t-i} + \mu_{2t} \quad (4)$$

where  $ECT_{t-1}$  is the error correction term obtained from the cointegration equation,  $\gamma$ ,  $\theta$  and  $\pi$  are estimated parameters, and  $\mu$  is stationary random processes with zero mean and constant variance. Granger (1988) notes that ECM provides two channels through which Granger causality can be detected. In the cointegrated system above [Equation (3)], LRM does not Granger cause LM if all the  $\theta$ 's are jointly insignificant or  $\gamma_1$  is statistically insignificant. Specifically, this hypothesis of no causality from LRM to LM can be formulated as  $H_0: \theta_{1i} = 0$  and  $\sigma_1 = 0$ . Conversely, the hypothesis of no causality from LM to LRM can be expressed as  $H_0: \pi_{1i} = 0$ , for all  $i$ .

### Results and Interpretations

The first step is to examine the order of integration of each series. It is important to check the stationarity properties of each variable as both the cointegration and Granger causality tests require all series must be I(1). The results of the augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) and Ng-Perron tests are shown in Table 1. Both unit root tests give similar results. The null hypothesis of non-stationary cannot be rejected in levels at the 5% significance level. The null hypothesis, however, can be rejected for all variables in first difference at the 5% significance level. Moreover, the tests suggest a possible deterministic trend for all series. This indicates that monetary measures (M1 and M2) and reserve money (RM) are I(1).

These findings testify that the cointegration test is a good starting point for examining the existence of long-run relationship between these series. The results of cointegration test between narrow money (broad money) and reserve money are reported in Table 2. The test shows that there is a single cointegrating vector for each one of six PICs, at 10% significance level or better.

The sign of reserve money (RM) on monetary aggregates is shown in Table 3. For narrow money (M1), the sign is positive and statistically significant for all PICs, which would suggest that a rise in the reserve money would lead to a higher narrow money in the long-run. The long-run estimated coefficients of reserve money on M1 show that an increase in reserve money by 1%, other things being constant, leads to an increase in M1 ranging from 0.7089% (Vanuatu) to 2.8267% (Samoa). Similarly, we find that there exists a strong positive relationship between broad money (M2) and reserve money for all PICs, and the estimated coefficients are ranged from 0.6178% (Vanuatu) to 3.9541% (Samoa). These findings are consistent with a priori expectations, which suggest that reserve money has a significant and positive effect on monetary aggregates in the long run.

As regards four other PICs, namely PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga, the test results confirm the existence of causality linkage running from reserve money to monetary aggregates (both M1 and M2). In all the four PICs, the ECTs in the equations with monetary aggregates as dependent variables have not only the theoretically expected negative signs but they are also statistically significant. However, the coefficients of ECTs in the equations with reserve money as dependent variable, are found statistically not significant, ruling out any causality linkage running from monetary aggregate to reserve money. The results confirm that money supply is exogenous in PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga and the causality linkage runs only from reserve money to monetary aggregates.

The existence of a long run equilibrium relationship between monetary measures (M1 and M2) and reserve money indicates that causality relationship must appear in at least one direction (Engle and Granger, 1987). Hence, we proceed to estimate a Granger causality test in examining the dynamic linkages of the variables in the short-run. Granger causality test within VECM model is estimated for those countries with a long run equilibrium relationship. The results of VECM estimation are shown in Table 4.



**Table 1: The Results of Unit Root Tests**

Variable / Country	ADF test				Ng-Perron test			
	Level		First Difference		Level		First Difference	
	Constant, without trend	Constant, with trend	Constant, without trend	Constant, with trend	Constant, without trend	Constant, with trend	Constant, without trend	Constant, with trend
<b>Fiji</b>								
M1	0.36 (0)	-3.06 (2)	-12.22** (0)	-12.26** (0)	2.16 (0)	-14.61 (0)	-54.01** (0)	-53.49** (0)
M2	-0.36 (0)	-1.10 (0)	-11.38** (0)	-11.34** (0)	1.67 (3)	-2.10 (0)	-43.58** (0)	-53.70** (0)
RM	0.57 (3)	-2.84 (6)	-9.51** (2)	-9.54** (2)	2.43 (2)	-15.59 (2)	-59.07** (1)	-51.78** (0)
<b>Papua New Guinea</b>								
M1	1.92 (0)	-2.51 (0)	-11.99** (0)	-12.62** (0)	2.71 (0)	-1.97 (0)	-21.37** (1)	-54.80** (0)
M2	2.92 (0)	-0.67 (0)	-8.62** (0)	-9.14** (0)	2.82 (1)	0.06 (0)	-27.38** (0)	-45.88** (0)
RM	1.00 (3)	-2.87 (3)	-8.64** (1)	-8.96** (1)	0.63 (0)	-4.53 (0)	-22.49** (0)	-22.48** (1)
<b>Samoa</b>								
M1	-1.46 (3)	-2.98 (7)	-10.92** (2)	-10.96** (2)	0.61 (0)	-1.62 (0)	-9.90** (0)	-18.44** (0)
M2	-2.33 (0)	-3.37 (6)	-9.81** (0)	-9.95** (0)	-2.33 (0)	-3.39 (2)	-9.81** (0)	-9.95** (0)
RM	-2.34 (2)	-2.05 (2)	-4.96** (3)	-4.94** (3)	1.57 (0)	-2.65 (0)	-16.20** (1)	-52.84** (0)
<b>Solomon Islands</b>								
M1	-0.18 (1)	-2.06 (0)	-13.85** (0)	-13.78** (0)	1.92 (0)	-8.55 (0)	-9.40** (1)	-21.08** (1)
M2	0.45 (0)	-1.21 (0)	-9.38** (0)	-9.38** (0)	1.80 (2)	-3.07 (0)	-34.09** (1)	-34.29** (1)
RM	0.37 (0)	-3.14 (4)	-10.38** (0)	-10.48** (0)	1.54 (0)	-5.66 (0)	-54.97** (0)	-55.00** (0)
<b>Tonga</b>								
M1	1.02 (7)	-1.26 (7)	-3.28** (6)	-3.64** (6)	2.33 (7)	-3.07 (7)	-11.40** (2)	-48.25** (2)
M2	1.38 (3)	-1.28 (4)	-4.58** (3)	-10.49** (2)	1.97 (4)	-4.89 (4)	-30.71** (1)	-48.57** (1)
RM	-1.54 (0)	-2.18 (0)	-10.50** (0)	-10.51** (0)	-5.57 (0)	-8.52 (0)	-34.21** (0)	-34.12** (0)
<b>Vanuatu</b>								
M1	-0.60 (1)	-3.41 (0)	-13.06** (0)	-13.00** (0)	1.97 (1)	-11.17 (0)	-51.22** (0)	-49.58** (0)
M2	-2.57 (2)	-3.16 (2)	-10.65** (0)	-11.05** (0)	1.19 (0)	-1.76 (0)	-10.75** (2)	-51.75** (0)
RM	-0.81 (3)	-3.02 (4)	-8.89** (2)	-8.85** (2)	1.05 (0)	-11.97 (4)	-64.03** (6)	-36.97** (5)

Note: The ADF critical value at 5% level is -2.9640 and -3.5629 for constant without

Note: The ADF critical value at 5% level is -2.9640 and -3.5629 for constant without trend and constant with trend regressions, respectively. These critical values are based on McKinnon. The optimal lag is selected on the basis of Akaike Information Criterion (AIC). The Ng and Perron critical value is based on Ng and Perron (2001) critical value and the optimal lag is selected based on Spectral GLS-detrended AR based on SIC. The null hypothesis of the test is: a series has a unit root. The figures in brackets denote number of lags. The asterisk \*\* denotes the rejection of the null hypothesis at the 5% level of significance.

**Table 2: Johansen Cointegration test**

	Null Hypothesis	Narrow Money (M1)		Broad Money (M2)	
		Trace Statistic	Maximum Eigenvalue Statistic	Trace Statistic	Maximum Eigenvalue Statistic
Fiji	$r=0$	26.5542***	26.2222***	13.5559*	12.9435*
	$r \leq 1$	0.3319	0.3319	0.6123	0.6123
Papua New Guinea	$r=0$	17.1633**	16.1190**	15.2034*	13.7595*
	$r \leq 1$	1.0443	1.0443	1.4438	1.4438
Samoa	$r=0$	15.4577*	14.9957**	13.4351*	13.4233*
	$r \leq 1$	0.4620	0.4620	0.0117	0.0117
Solomon Islands	$r=0$	14.6579*	14.5621**	16.3996**	13.6889*
	$r \leq 1$	0.0957	0.0957	2.7107	2.7107
Tonga	$r=0$	20.0533***	19.8109***	30.7949***	28.1522***
	$r \leq 1$	0.2423	0.2423	2.6426	2.6426
Vanuatu	$r=0$	19.3858***	18.6184**	14.7637*	14.3190**
	$r \leq 1$	0.7674	0.7674	0.4447	0.4447

Notes:  $r$  is the number of cointegrating vectors. \*, \*\* and \*\*\* denote rejection of the null hypothesis at the 0.10, 0.05 and 0.01 significance levels, respectively.

**Table 3: Normalised Coefficient between Monetary Aggregates and Reserve Money**

Country	M1	RM	M2	RM
Fiji	-1.0000	1.129*** [47.4913]	-1.0000	0.8951*** [15.7519]
Papua New Guinea	-1.0000	1.0578*** [20.2283]	-1.0000	0.8521*** [14.7299]
Samoa	-1.0000	2.8267*** [4.17947]	-1.0000	3.9541*** [3.82573]
Solomon Islands	-1.0000	1.0473*** [13.0516]	-1.0000	0.9337*** [8.59100]
Tonga	-1.0000	1.1544*** [6.25521]	-1.0000	0.8242*** [4.37768]
Vanuatu	-1.0000	0.7089*** [22.6164]	-1.0000	0.6178*** [8.75974]

Notes: The vectors are normalised for monetary aggregates (M1 and M2). \*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significance at 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively. Figures in square parentheses [ ] refer to t-test statistics.

Granger causality tests show that there exists a bi-directional causality between monetary aggregates and reserve money for Fiji and Vanuatu (Table 4). The coefficients of error correction terms (ECTs) for these two countries are significant at the 10% level or better, and have a negative sign. This suggests that in Fiji and Vanuatu, money supply, (narrow and broad money) is endogenous. For these reasons, money multiplier in Fiji and Vanuatu would not be relevant, as was argued by Jayaraman and Ward (2003).



**Table 4: Granger causality results based on vector error correction model for Selected PICs**

Country	RM-led M1	ECT	M1-led RM	ECT	RM-led M2	ECT	M2-led RM	ECT
Fiji	42.5956***	-0.3231***	2.6333**	-0.2869*	17.9031***	-0.0655***	5.10***	-0.0645***
PNG	9.5825***	-0.0631*	1.5218	-0.0083	12.2327***	-0.0450**	0.9730	-0.0015
Samoa	2.6398**	-0.0153*	0.9308	-0.0056	3.5145***	-0.0031*	1.5374	-0.1410
Solomon Islands	6.8638***	-0.0522***	1.3578	-0.0143	4.0107***	-0.0563**	0.4532	-0.0212
Tonga	5.8885***	-0.3125***	1.1076	-0.0913	7.8667***	-0.0828*	0.7479	-0.9000
Vanuatu	4.5342***	-0.2107***	1.9991**	-0.4195*	3.0229***	-0.1199***	5.0029**	-0.2539*

Note: The Wald statistic which tests the joint significance of the lagged values of the independent variables is reported. This statistic is to be compared with F-statistics. \*, \*\* and \*\*\* denote rejection of the null hypothesis at the 0.10, 0.05 and 0.01 significance levels, respectively.

### Conclusions with Policy Implications

This commentary undertook an empirical investigation asking whether there was any long-run, stable relationship between monetary aggregates (narrow and broad money) and reserve money in six PICs, namely Fiji, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu, which have independent currencies of their own, with specific focus on the direction of relationship between reserve money and monetary aggregate, both in the short-and long-runs.

The empirical findings are summarised as follows: (i) there is a long run, cointegrating relationship between monetary aggregates and reserve money in all PICs; (ii) the long-run coefficient of reserve money in the equation with monetary aggregate, narrow money or broad money, is significant; and (iii) it has a positive relationship with monetary aggregate for all PICs.

Resorting to Granger causality tests, we note that there is bi-directional causality between monetary aggregates and reserve money for Fiji and Vanuatu and hence the conclusion is money supply is endogenous in Fiji and Vanuatu.

On the contrary, the empirical results confirm that reserve money Granger causes monetary aggregates for PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga and there is no bi-directional causality relationship. Thus, money supply is exogenous in these four PICs, confirming reserve money has great predictive

power over monetary aggregates. Therefore, the four PICs can successfully aim at changes in reserves to influence changes in money supply.

On the other hand, Fiji and Vanuatu cannot exclusively rely on manipulating reserve money. Indirect instruments in these two countries with a view to effecting changes in central bank balance sheets for altering money supply will not be as effective as direct instruments. The latter will work better, as they alter commercial bank balance sheets, such as credit ceilings and other restrictions.

It is worth recalling that from early 2007, following the December 2006 coup, Fiji's central bank suspended its regular open market operations in its Reserve Bank of Fiji (RBF) Notes, which were primarily intended at influencing short-term interest rates. Instead, RBF switched on to direct measures for discouraging credit growth. This was in keeping with study findings on G7 countries by Howells and Hussein (1998) that, if endogeneity existed, policy instruments should be aimed directly at the credit counterparts of the money stock.

### References

- Engle, R. and Granger, C. 1987. 'Co-integration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing'. *Econometrica*, 55: 251-276.
- Goodhart, C. A. E. 1984. *Monetary Theory and Practice*. London: Macmillan.
- Goodhart, C.A.E. 1994. 'What Should Central Banks Do? What should be their Macroeconomic Objectives and Operations'. *Economic Journal*, 104:1424-1436.
- Granger, C.W.J. 1988. 'Some Recent Developments in a Concept of Causality'. *Journal of Econometrics*, 39: 199-211.
- Greenidge, K., Craigwell, R. and Downes D. 2001. 'Can Money Endogeneity be Generalised? Empirical Evidence from Caribbean Economies'. *International Advances in Economic Research*, 7 (2): 253-258.
- Howells, P. and Hussein, K. 1998. 'The Endogeneity of Money: Evidence from the G7'. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 45 (3): 329-340.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). 2008. *International Financial Statistics*. CD Rom. October. Washington, D.C.: IMF.
- Jayaraman, T.K. and Ward, B. 2003. 'Is Money Multiplier Relevant in a Small open Economy? Empirical Evidence from Fiji'. *Pacific Economic Bulletin*, 19 (2): 48-53.

- McClean, W.A. 1981. 'The Stability and Predictive Efficiency of the Traditional Multiplier in the Jamaica Context: A Comment on Bourne's Analysis'. *Social and Economic Studies*, 30(3): 137-143.
- McClean, W.A. 1985. 'Further Comment on the Conventional Money Multiplier'. *Social and Economic Studies*, 34 (3): 85-86.
- McClean, W.A. 1997. 'Monetary Dynamics in Barbados: The Evidence from Cointegration Analysis and Error Correction Modelling'. In D. Worrell and R. Craigwell (eds.) *Macroeconomic and Finance in the Caribbean: Quantitative Analyses*. St. Augustine, Trinidad: Caribbean Centre for Monetary Studies, 85-106.
- McClean, W.A. 1998. 'The M1-MO Relation in Barbados: 'Some Evidence on Causality'. *A Working Paper presented at the Annual Review Seminar of Research Department, Central Bank of Barbados (mimeo), Bridgetown: Central Bank of Barbados*.
- Pierce, D.G. and Tysome, P. J. 1985. *Monetary Economics: Theories, Evidence and Policy*, London: Butterwood.