УДК: 336.748(575.1)

https://dx.doi.org/10.36522/2181-9637-2019-1-2

ЎЗБЕК СЎМИ КУРСИГА ТАЪСИР ЭТУВЧИ ДЕТЕРМИНАНТЛАР

ДЕТЕРМИНАНТЫ КОЛЕБАНИЙ ОБМЕННОГО КУРСА УЗБЕКСКОЙ ВАЛЮТЫ – СУМА

DETERMINANTS OF EXCHANGE RATE FLUCTUATIONS OF UZBEK SUM

Berdinazarov Zafar Ulashovich

PhD in Economics, Chief Economist at Statistics and Research department of the Central Bank of Uzbekistan

Mamasalaev Jamshid Kudrat ugli

Specialist at Statistics and Research department of the Central Bank of Uzbekistan

Fakhodjonov Jakhongirmirzo Mirzakarim ugli

Specialist at Statistics and Research department of the Central Bank of Uzbekistan

Dodoyev Khasanjon Ilkhomjon ugli

Specialist at Statistics and Research department of the Central Bank of Uzbekistan

Аннотация. *Мазкур мақолада миллий валюта – сўмнинг АҚШ долларига нисбатан алмашув курсига таъсир этувчи омиллар (детерминантлар) уч турдаги эконометрик моделлар, яъни энг кичик квадратлар (Ordinary Least Squares), ўртача қийматли интеграциялашган авторегрессия (Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average) ҳамда кўп ўлчовли узоқ хотирали шартли гетроскедастлилик авторегрессия (Multivariate Long memory Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskadasticity) моделлари орқали таҳлил қилинган. Модель натижалари сўмнинг номинал ва реал алмашув курсига кенг пул массаси ва чет элдан келаётган пул ўтказмаларининг таъсирини статистик жиҳатдан аҳамиятли эканлигини, фоиз ставкаси ва инфляция даражасини эса аҳамиятсиз эканлигини кўрсатди. Шунингдек, ушбу таҳлиллар соф ташқи савдонинг таъсирини ҳам сўм алмашув курсига ижобий баҳолаш имконини бермади.*

Таянч тушунчалар: *алмашув курси, фоиз ставкаси, пул таклифи, соф ташқи савдо, пул ўтказмалари: E24, E39, E52, E65.*

Аннотация. *В настоящей статье рассматриваются детерминанты колебаний обменного курса узбекской валюты – сума к доллару США с использованием трех эконометрических моделей OLS (обычные наименьшие квадраты), ARIMA (авторегрессионное интегрированное скользящее среднее) и ML ARCH (многомерная авторегрессионная условная гетероскадастичность с длительной памятью). Результаты моделирования показали, что влияние денежной массы и денежных переводов на номинальный и реальный обменные курсы является статистически значимым; влияние инфляции и процентной ставки не является эконометрически значимым. В эконометрическом анализе уровень чистого влияния торговли на обменный курс не дал позитивный отклик.*

Ключевые слова: *обменные курсы, процентная ставка, денежная масса, чистая торговля, денежные переводы: E24, E39, E52, E65.*

Annotation. *The paper examines the determinants of exchange rate fluctuations of Uzbek sum using three econometric models as OLS (Ordinary Least Squares), ARIMA (Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average) and MLARCH (Multivariate Longmemory Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskadasticity). Model results show that the effects of money supply and remittances to the nominal and real exchange rates (USD/UZS) are found statistically significant; the impacts of inflation and interest rate are not econometrically meaningful. It should be noted that the level of net trade influences to the exchange rate is not conclusive in our econometric analysis.*

Key words: *exchange rates, interest rate, money supply, net trade, remittance jel: E24, E39, E52, E65.*

Introduction

The fact that the trade policy plays a key role in ensuring high level of output and stable price is widely acknowledged. The guarantee of high level of output and stable price largely depends on the exchange rate policy. Accordingly, the optimal way for monetary policy in achieving the goal is to have a stable exchange rate. One matter that remains abundantly clear is that too highly appreciation of local currency depresses the external demand for local goods, which means that the amount of export is affected negatively. However, at the same time, with too rapid depreciation of local currency the exporters are unlikely to get benefit from selling their goods. Bearing this in mind, controlling and keeping foreign exchange rate at desirable level for the economy urges to define the main influencing factors (determinants) of exchange rate.

Literature Review

A huge amount of studies on foreign exchange rate determinants have been conducted in recent decades, since the economic importance of foreign exchange rate is considered as one of the essential factors for trading economies. Determinants of exchange rate volatility have frequently been an area of interest for many macroeconomists worldwide. However, this subject in transition economies still remains empirically unexplored. Some of the researches in the context of other countries will be reviewed in chronological order as follows.

The preliminary interests on this study commenced after the introduction of optimal currency area by R.Mundell [1] in 1960s and constitution of European Monetary Union where floating exchange rate has been considered to be an optimal policy for Euro zone. Consequently, majority of macroeconomists were involved to examine the factors of exchange rate volatility. One of them is A.Rose [2], who reported that the best interference instrument in exchange is the change in interest rate, which is an independent variable explaining the sensitivity of exchange rate. Whereas, D.Ariccia [3] proved that the exchange rate volatility was also affected by financial variables, especially the external debt.

A theory proposed by Irving Fisher – 'Fisher effect', also describes the interest rate differential to reflect the exchange rate expectation. The theory further illustrates that an expected change in the current exchange rate between any two currencies is approximately equivalent to the differences between the two countries the nominal interest rates for that time [4, 5]. Spot exchange rate is expected to change equally but in the opposite direction of the interest rate differential. Thus, the currency of the country with the higher nominal interest rate is expected to depreciate against the currency of the country with the lower nominal interest rate, as higher nominal interest rate reflects an expectation of inflation. High real interest rate significantly reduces the exchange rate volatility [6].

Madura, J. [7] states that it is not ideal relationship between exchange rates and inflation rates differential, however, he argued that in the long run, inflation differentials may be used for forecasting of exchange rate volatility. The exchange rate is not only determined by the domestic interest rate but also influenced by the changes in the interest rate by the major world economies. Hence, it may be concluded that in case of single economy, there exists a negative correlation between exchange rate volatility and interest rate [8].

While the focus of the previous literature has been on the effect of the exchange rate uncertainty on the incentive impacts on net trade, a few authors have examined the "reverse" relationship on the impacts of international trade on exchange rate. Mundell's[9] optimal currency area assumptions suggest inverse causality, whereby trade flows stabilize real exchange rate fluctuations, hence reducing real exchange rate volatility. Broda and Romalis [10] state that such causality should be addressed as "…most of the exciting studies have focused on the effects of

exchange rate regimes or volatility on trade by assuming that the exchange rate process is driven by exogenous shocks and is unaffected by other variables".

A broad research has been accomplished to check the remittance and exchange rate relationship. During the panel data analysis of 13 Latin American economies over 20 years, Amuedo-Dorantes and Pozo [11] exposed that worker remittance appreciate exchange rates. In addition, the researchers claim that doubling the remittances to GDP ratio led to a real exchange rate appreciation above 22%. In a relevant analysis, Barajas et al. [12] disagree that the effect of remittances on the exchange rates varies across countries. Later, Mandelman and Acosta [13, 14and 15] found that remittances are the main cause of real exchange rate appreciation.

Table 1.

Summary Statistics

	NOMINAL EXRATE_ OFFICIAL	REM_S	M2	NET_TRADE	INFL	I_RATE
Mean	2342.109	4044.035	2.73E+13	547.2689	2.877647	15.98889
Median	1914.800	3500.145	2.32E+13	595.1000	2.986291	16.20000
Maximum	8156.680	13223.96	7.41E+13	2015.500	7.871467	20.20000
Minimum	1243.600	356.8818	4.72E+12	-769.0000	-0.034984	13.40000
Std. Dev.	1485.075	2912.185	1.95E+13	602.3994	1.813764	1.795857
Skewness	2.806774	0.975118	0.951092	0.259045	0.213938	0.133564
Kurtosis	11.07957	3.766163	3.068164	2.648873	2.635516	2.188610
Jarque-Bera	181.4839	8.232043	6.793035	0.734452	0.592361	1.368210
Probability	0.000000	0.016309	0.033490	0.692653	0.743653	0.504542
Sum	105394.9	181981.6	1.23E+15	24627.10	129.4941	719.5000
Sum Sq. Dev.	97039753	3.73E+08	1.67E+28	15966942	144.7486	141.9044
Observations	45	45	45	45	45	45

Similar results have been taken by other panel of initiatives as Hassan and Holmes[16]. In contrast, Rajan and Subramanian [17] for instance, argue that remittances do not result in the phenomenon known as the Dutch disease (negative consequences arising from large increases in the value of a country's currency from any large influx of foreign currency into a country).

Lately, Tariq [18] conducted a research to examine the correlation of money supply and exchange rate volatility in the case of Pakistan. On the basis of empirical evidence it is concluded that money supply has reverse relationship with exchange rate volatility. It has also been found that money supply (policy variable) has inverse relationship with exchange rate volatility. Therefore, money supply may be efficient to restraint the exchange rate volatility.

Data Description

The study hypothetically sets the following 5 variables over the period of 2007q1-2018q1to define the exchange rate determinants in Uzbekistan: money Supply (M2); net export (export-import); inflation; remittances and interest rate (see Table 1).

According to the table of the summary statistics, quarterly average official exchange rate ($1 USD=UZS) was equal to approximately 2342 UZS for the period. Indeed, the table illustrates that the minimum exchange rate was equal to 1243UZS at the beginning of the selected period, while the maximum exchange rate was 8156 UZS per a US dollar. However, quarterly interest rate and inflation rate fluctuated over the period, and made up an average of 16% and 3% respectively. In fact, even though there were some fluctuations in interest rate, its overall trend was downward. Quarterly inflation rate was unstable between 2007q1 and 2018q1. The mean of money supply (M2) during 2007Q1 – 2018Q1 was equal to around 27.3 billion per quarter.

According to the summary statistics table minimum money supply equals to 47.2 billion UZS, while maximum M2 was equal to 74.1 billion UZS. Furthermore, quarterly average of the net export was around 547 million USD. It should be noted that the minimum level of net export for the period was negative, namely 770 million USD, while the highest point was almost 2 billion of US dollars. The last but not least determinant of exchange rate, the average amount of remittances to the host economy recorded almost 4.896 billion USDin 2017 and 3.827 billion in 2018Q3 (accumulated).

In general, while exchange rate, money supply (M2) and remittances showed an upward trend during the selected period, the interest rate and the amount of net trade in the economy decreased over the time-frame. Quarterly inflation rate fluctuated over the period ranging from roughly 0 to 8% (See the graph below).

Empirical Methodology

The fact that the following research aims to define the determinants of the exchange rate in Uzbekistan economy urges to apply the OLS method to analyze and estimate the extent of the abovementioned variables on exchange rate. Moreover, due to the presence of non-stationary and heteroskedasticity, the research is conducted on the basis of the time-series models ARIMA and ML ARCH respectively.

The current study also approaches to some econometric specification tests. Namely, Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey and ARCH tests are applied to determine whether heteroskedasticity is present or not in the obtained data (see appendices, Table 1 and Table 2). Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Testis used to define whether the residuals are correlated across the series (Table 3). In addition, whereas the underlying study carries out the Ramsey test (Table 4) in order to check whether there is the sign of omitting variable or not, the Chow test (Table 5) is applied for detecting the structural break within the taken period.

Graph.



In this empirical study, the standard model is as follows:

$$Y = X(0)+C(1)*X1 + C(2)*X2 + C(3)*X3 + C(4)*X4 + C(5)*X5 +$$

Where:

Y – the log of [exchange rate ($1=UZS)]

X0 – constant term

X1 – the log of money supply (M2)

X2 – inflation rate

X3 – the log of remittances in USD

X4 – interest rate

X5 – the log of net trade in USD

μ - error term (disturbance)

Specification Tests and Its Results

It is evident from the Table 1, illustrated in the appendices, that p-value of the Breusch-Pagan-Godfreytest is not statistically significant, and the evidence to conclude that variances are not constant across the series is not sufficient. However, ARCH test shows that the variances are constant across the series and the sum of the ARCH and GARCH coefficients is very close to one. Moreover, when Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM test was applied, it was found that there is high first-level of autocorrelation (serial correlation) across the residuals. At the same time, in order to define whether the constructed model has omitted variables or not, the study approaches to the Ramsey test. As it is clear from the p-value, which is equal to almost 0, there is enough evidence to conclude that the constructed model has no omitted variables. In addition, to ensure the reliability of the estimates, the study checks whether the data is normally distributed or not, and it found that the residuals

are normally distributed in accordance with Jarque-Bera (see Table 6 in appendices).

The following table indicates the corresponding coefficients of each regressor included in the model (standard errors of the coefficients in parentheses). Significance levels are depicted by the stars, *p<0.05, **p<0.01 and *** p<0.001 respectively.

Table 2.

Model Findings

Explanatory Variables	OLS	ARIMA	ML ARCH
I_RATE			
Coefficient	0.0103	0.0103	-0.0124
Std. error	(0.0153)	(0.0247)	(0.0092)
P-value	0.5030	0.675	0.1776
INFLATION			
Coefficient	-0.0022	-0.0022	-0.0060
Std. error	(0.0131)	(0.0172)	(0.0068)
P-value	0.8654	0.896	0.3823
M2			
Coefficient	1.0073***	1.0073***	0.8175
Std. error	(0.0823)	(0.1153)	(0.0470)
P-value	0.0000	0.000	0.0000
NET_TRADE			
Coefficient	0.0382*	0.0382*	0.0317*
Std. error	(0.0181)	(0.0592)	(0.0165)
P-value	0.0422	0.519	0.0554
REMMITTANCE			
Coefficient	-0.2467	-0.2467	-0.2039
Std. error	(0.0676)	(0.0731)	(0.0338)
P-value	0.0028	0.001	0.0000
CONSTANT			
Coefficient	-14.4112	-14.4112	1.4124
Std. error	(1.6076)	(2.6104)	(0.3852)
P-value	0.3850	0.000	0.0002
R-SQUARED	0.9549	0.9549	0.9167
Adjusted R-squared	0.9492	0.9492	0.9061
p> F or CHI2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0537

Before turning to the next section, it is highly essential to note that interpretations of the obtained results will be provided based on the 3 models, namely OLS, ARIMA and MLARCH. Starting with the OLS model, the obtained results present that interest rate has no impact on determining exchange rate in Uzbekistan economy during the period of 2007q1 and 2018q1. This insignificant relationship between exchange rate and interest rate is also confirmed by the statistics provided by ARIMA and MLARCH models at even 1% significance level. Meanwhile, inflation is not found to have a statistically significant effect on exchange rate in accordance with three econometric models namely OLS, ARIMA and MLARCH.

Turning to the discussion of money supply and its impact on exchange rate, it is clear that money supply (M2) is found to be a key factor in determining exchange rate. Specifically, all selected models, namely OLS, ARIMA and MLARCH indicate that 1% increase in M2 results in approximately 1% depreciation of Uzbek sums against US dollars, the fact which highly confirms and increases the reliability of coefficient obtained. More strikingly, according to the all-aforementioned models, net trade and exchange rate are positively associated during the selected period. However, ARIMA model shows that the effect of net trade on exchange rate is statistically insignificant (p-value 0.519). As previously mentioned in the literature part, the amount of remittances and exchange rate are positively correlated meaning that if the inflow of remittances to the host country increases, it simply leads to the appreciation of local currency. In our empirical analysis, it is found that 1% rise in the inflow of remittances in USD to Uzbekistan economy should cause roughly 0.24% appreciation of Uzbek sums against US dollars. The underlying correlation is also affirmed by all 3 models.

Conclusion

All in all, while the effects of remittances and money supply on the dynamic of exchange rate are found statistically significant, the impacts of inflation and interest rate are not econometrically meaningful. It should be noted that the way the level of net trade influences the exchange rate is not conclusive in our econometric analysis.

Having considered all above, the following might be suggested to the policymakers and related parties:

- the policymakers, namely Central bank should carefully control the level of money supply (M2) in the economy, since it can keep the exchange rate at appropriate level for the economy;
- econometric models applied to the study have not approved the significance of net trade on the level of exchange rate; it is highly emphasized by other studies as stated in the literature review part, stating that it has its positive impact on shaping the level of exchange rate. Therefore, the responsible parties of the government should highly pay attention to the integration of Uzbekistan workforce into other foreign economies, and redirect their salary to Uzbekistan;
- regardless of the fact that the study did not find strong simultaneous evidence to confirm the sensible effect of interest rate by commercial banks, at least one model shows a strong negative correlation between commercial interest rate and the level of exchange rate, which meansthat an increase in interest rate should appreciate UZS against USD;
- since the study found no credible evidence concerning the effect of inflation on shaping the level of exchange rate, while the goal of the government is keeping an appropriate level of exchange rate, holding the desirable inflation rate should not be necessarily at the centre of feature to consider.

References

1. *Friedman, M. and A.J. Schwartz, 1982. Monetary trends in the United States and the United Kingdom. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.*
2. *Rose, A., 1996. Explaining exchange rate volatility: an empirical analysis of the holy trinity of monetary independence, fixed exchange rates and capital mobility. Journal of International Money and Finance, 15(6): 925-945.*
3. *Dell'Ariccia, G., 1999. Exchange rate fluctuations and trade flows: Evidence from the European Union. IMF-Staff- Papers, 46(3): 315-334.*
4. *Devereux, M. and P. Lane, 2003. Understanding bilateral exchange rate volatility. Journal of International Economics, 60(1): 109-132.*
5. *Robert, F.E. and C.W.J. Granger, 1987. Error Correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing. Econometrica, 55(2): 251-276*
6. *Dornbusch, R., 1976. Expectations and exchange rate dynamics. Journal of Political Economics, 84(6):*

1161-1176

7. Madura, J., 2000. International financial management. 6 edition, South-Western College Publishing.

8. Duasa, J., 2009. Exchange Rate Shock on Malaysian Prices on Import and Export and Empirical Analysis. Journal of Economic Cooperation and Development, 30(3): 99-144.

9. Mundell, Robert (1961), A Theory of Optimum Currency Areas, American Economic Review 51 (September): 657-665.

10. Broda, Christian and John Romalis (2003), Identifying the Relationship between Trade and Exchange Rate Volatility, available at https//faculty.chicagobooth.edu/john.romalis/research/erv_trade.pdf

11. Amuedo-Dorantes, C., & Pozo, S. (2004). Workers' remittances and the real exchange rate: a paradox of gifts. World development, 32(8), 1407-1417.

12. Mandelman, F. S. (2013). Monetary and exchange rate policy under remittance fluctuations. Journal of Development Economics, 102, 128-147.

13. Barajas, A., Chami, R., Hakura, D., & Montiel, P. J. (2010). Workers' Remittances and the Equilibrium Real Exchange Rate: Theory and Evidence. IMF Working Papers, 1-42.

14. Acosta, P. A., Lartey, E. K., & Mandelman, F. S. (2009). Remittances and the Dutch disease. Journal of international economics, 79 (1), 102-116.

15. Acosta, P. A., Baerg, N. R., & Mandelman, F. S. (2009). Financial development, remittances, and real exchange rate appreciation. Economic Review-Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, 94(1), I.

16. Hassan, G. M., & Holmes, M. J. (2013). Remittances and the real effective exchange rate. Applied Economics, 45(35), 4959-4970.

17. Rajan, Raghuram G. and Arvind Subramanian (2009), Aid Dutch Disease and Manufacturing Growth, Center for Global Development in its series Working Papers 196.

18. Tariq, M. Ali (2015). Impact of Interest Rate, Inflation and Money Supply on Exchange Rate Volatility in Pakistan. Pakistan Council for Science and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Appendices

Table 1.

Heteroskedasticity Test: Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey

F-statistic	1.549365	Prob. F(5,39)	0.1972
Obs*R-squared	7.457343	Prob. Chi-Square(5)	0.1888
Scaled explained SS	6.017053	Prob. Chi-Square(5)	0.3046

Table 2.

Heteroskedasticity Test: ARCH

F-statistic	3.881121	Prob. F(1,42)	0.0554
Obs*R-squared	3.721995	Prob. Chi-Square(1)	0.0537

Table 3.

Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test:

F-statistic	18.12219	Prob. F(4,35)	0.0000
Obs*R-squared	30.34731	Prob. Chi-Square(4)	0.0000

Table 4.

Ramsey RESET Test

Equation: EQ01_OLS				
Specification: LN_NEXRATE LN_M2 INFL I_RATE LN_NTRADE LN_REM_S C				
Omitted Variables: Squares of fitted values				
	Value	**df**	**Probability**	
t-statistic	4.349319	38	0.0001	
F-statistic	18.91658	(1, 38)	0.0001	
Likelihood ratio	18.18002	1	0.0000	

Table 5.

Chow Breakpoint Test: 2008Q4

Null Hypothesis: No breaks at specified breakpoints				
Varying regressors: All equation variables				
Equation Sample: 2007Q1 2018Q1				
F-statistic	0.554364		Prob. F(6,33)	0.7630
Log likelihood ratio	4.321402		Prob. Chi-Square(6)	0.6333
Wald Statistic	3.326181		Prob. Chi-Square(6)	0.7669

Table 6.

Histogram Normality Test (residuals)



Table 7.

Null Hypothesis: Var has a unit root (non-stationary) p-value

I_RATE	
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	**-1.9640**
INFLATION	
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	**-1.5095**
M2	
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	**-1.8502**
NET_TRADE	**-6.2283**
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	
REM	
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	**-0.0558**
N_EXRATE	
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	**-0.1353**

: