

Symmetric and asymmetric effects of exchange rates on money demand: empirical evidence from Vietnam

Sy-Hoa Ho & Jamel Saadaoui

To cite this article: Sy-Hoa Ho & Jamel Saadaoui (2021): Symmetric and asymmetric effects of exchange rates on money demand: empirical evidence from Vietnam, Applied Economics, DOI: [10.1080/00036846.2021.1888864](https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2021.1888864)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2021.1888864>



Published online: 28 Feb 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 136



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Symmetric and asymmetric effects of exchange rates on money demand: empirical evidence from Vietnam

Sy-Hoa Ho ^a and Jamel Saadaoui ^b

^aInstitute of Research and Development, Duy-Tan University; Da Nang, Vietnam; ^bUniversity of Strasbourg, University of Lorraine, BETA, CNRS, Strasbourg, France

ABSTRACT

This empirical investigation aims at exploring the determinants of money demand in Vietnam by using both linear and nonlinear autoregressive distributed lag models over the period spanning from the third quarter of 2000 to the first quarter of 2018. Our findings can be summarized as follows: firstly, when the shock is symmetric (i.e. a permanent nominal appreciation of 1%), the money demand increases by 3.7% in the long term. Secondly, when the shock is asymmetric, for a permanent nominal appreciation of 1%, we observe an increase of 15.6% in the money demand. Whereas for a permanent nominal depreciation of 1%, we observe a decrease of 7.4% in the money demand. These results are consistent with symmetry tests and lead us to think that asymmetries occur mainly in the short run and are transmitted to the long run.

KEYWORDS

Money demand; exchange rate; ARDL models; NARDL models; dollarization

JEL CLASSIFICATION

C22; E41; F31; F33; F41

1. Introduction

Vietnam has been one of the most buoyant economies in the world with an average economic growth of 6.45% over the period spanning from 2000 to 2018. In the context of high economic growth, the rate of inflation has known several swings during this period. Indeed, it surged to 2-digit inflation in the crisis period between 2008 and 2011. Facing these upward inflation pressures, the government has taken a series of measures¹ in 2011 and 2014, to rein in inflation pressures and ensure macroeconomic stability. In this perspective, the State Bank of Vietnam (SBV, hereafter) used several monetary instruments.

On the one hand, the SBV regulates the monetary aggregates to contain price inflation. The money supply growth is regulated by setting the money growth target at the beginning of each year. As a result, the inflation rate has been well controlled, and was stable with an average rate of 3.5% over the period spanning from 2014 to 2018.

On the other hand, the SBV has regulated the exchange rate regime with more flexibility to reflect market developments. The exchange rate regime of the U.S. dollar/Vietnamese dong exchange rate

corresponds to a crawling peg. The SBV sets the reference rate to follow foreign exchange market developments, and the exchange rate will move in a band setting by the central bank to pursue its policy objectives. Before 2015, the reference rate was an average of the latest traded market price. At the end of 2015, the reference rate was calculated based on a basket of eight currencies in order to be more market oriented. The band was small during the inflation pressure period ($-/+1\%$, then $-/+2\%$), and in the recent period, the band is $-/+3\%$.

In this general context, our study aims to improve the understanding of monetary developments in Vietnam. Indeed, as briefly seen above, monetary aggregates play a crucial role in the conduct of the monetary policy in this country. Thus, our empirical investigation tries to improve the literature on the determinants of money demand for the Vietnamese economy. As noted by Mundell (1963), the money demand could depend upon the exchange rate in addition to the level of income and the rate of interest.²

We try to assess the impact of nominal exchange rate on the money demand thanks to linear and nonlinear dynamic models (i.e. ARDL and NARDL

CONTACT Jamel Saadaoui  jamelsaadaoui@gmail.com  University of Strasbourg, University of Lorraine, BETA, CNRS, Strasbourg, France

¹These measures are described in two directives issued by the SBV: the directive 11/NQ-CP of 24 February 2011, and the directive 01/CT-NHNN of 15 January 2014.

²We suppose that, at equilibrium, the money demand is equal to money supply, since the demand in excess will not be satisfied.

models), as there are no a priori reasons to believe that exchange rate depreciation and appreciation will have the same effect on money demand. After a nominal depreciation against the U.S. dollar, domestic residents can hold more foreign currency to protect themselves from this adverse exchange rate variation. This currency substitution effect may explain the phenomenon of dollarization in Vietnam. As there is no reason indicating that waves of dollarization (after a nominal depreciation) or waves of de-dollarization (after a nominal appreciation) are symmetric, we use two specifications, a symmetric specification and an asymmetric specification that opens the possibility to explore of non-linear effects. Since the pioneering contribution of Mundell (1960), it is well known that this phenomenon of dollarization may hinder the conduct of an autonomous monetary policy in absence of capital controls.³ As underlined by Aizenman and Ito (2014), the trilemma constraint can raise a number of issues for developing countries. Thus, these empirical results could be especially interesting to improve the interaction between the monetary policy and the exchange rate policy in Vietnam.

In the empirical literature, nonlinear models are explored and used more frequently as rigidity in linear models is prone to biased or distorted interpretation. The literature reviewing such asymmetric and non-linear models begins with Balke and Fomby (1997) who introduce the threshold cointegration with a regime-switching-type model. Then, Granger and Yoon (2002) highlight the 'hidden cointegration' explaining that if the positive and negative components are cointegrated, the series bear the 'hidden cointegration'. Schorderet (2003) develops the paper of Granger and Yoon (2002) to estimate the asymmetric effect of hidden cointegration. Based on the work of Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (2001), some studies test the cointegration of small sample Narayan (2005). Finally, Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014) introduce a nonlinear version of the framework of Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (2001) to explore the asymmetries in the short term and/or in the long term.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: we resume the literature review in the second

section; then, we present the econometric methodology used in this study. We show the results in the fourth section, and we conclude in the last section.

II. Literature

Industrialized countries

Bahmani-Oskooee and Chomsisengphet (2002) investigate the determinants of money demand and check the stability for industrial countries including Australia, Austria, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and the USA by using an ECM model over various periods for each country. They found that real income, interest rate on three-month T-Bills and nominal effective exchange rate are the determinants of money demand. In addition, they demonstrate the stability for all countries except Switzerland and the UK.

Dreger and Wolters (2010) also point out the strong stability in the long term of money demand in the EMU with quarterly data over the period spanning from the first quarter of 1983 to the last quarter of 2004 by including the inflation rate and allowing short-run homogeneity in the cointegration model. Moreover, they use a threshold autoregressive model to demonstrate the existence of a monetary target (as a threshold for the inflation rate) that impacts money demand.

Emerging countries

Bahmani-Oskooee, Kutan, and Xi (2013) study the same research question, but focus on emerging markets such as six Central and Eastern European emerging economies (Armenia, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Russia) and four other emerging economies (Bolivia, South Africa, Colombia and Malaysia). By replacing the interest rate variable by the inflation rate and including two variables such as economic uncertainty and monetary uncertainty, they point out that money demand is stable in all countries over the studied period. In addition, Bahmani-

³The well-known Impossible Trinity problem (i.e. an impossible combination of an autonomous monetary policy, a perfect capital mobility and a floating exchange rate) is also referred to as the Trilemma, a more neutral term.

Oskooee and Rehman (2005) focus on Asian developing countries such as India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand in the quarterly periods of 1973–2000. Their results demonstrate that the M1 monetary aggregate is stable over time for India, Indonesia and Singapore, whereas the M2 aggregate is stable for the remaining countries. Moreover, in a recent article, Bahmani-Oskooee et al. (2019) examine the determinants of money demand for India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand by using both ARDL and NARDL models. They find that exchange rate appreciation and depreciation significantly influence the money demand in all countries. In more detail, the appreciation of the currency has an adverse effect on the money demand for India, Indonesia, but a positive effect for the Philippines and Singapore, and no effect for Korea.

Evidence for the Vietnamese economy

Very few empirical studies have explored money determinants for Vietnam. Nguyen and Pfau (2010) employ quarterly data from the first quarter of 1999 to the second quarter of 2009 and error-correction models. They find that the long-run determinants of money demand are national income, foreign interest rate (FED rate) and real stock price. Inflation and nominal exchange rates are included, but are excluded in the final estimation. They also confirm the stability of money demand during the sample period.

The same research question is explored in Lai (2012) who extends the sample period by 2 years thanks to an ARDL model. She uses a variable list including domestic income, expected inflation,⁴ nominal exchange rate and gold price to explain the money demand dynamics. Her findings can be summarized as follows: the exchange rate is the most important variable that determines the money demand dynamics. A depreciation of 1% for the Vietnamese dong should induce a decrease between 3.1% and 6% for the money demand.

Pham and Bui (2018) also study this research question by using a vector error correction model in the monthly period from 2003 to 2014. They indicate that gold price and real effective exchange rate are important variables to determine real money demand, whereas the deposit interest rate is not significant.

Even though the relationship between exchange rate and money demand has been investigated in previous research, there are still shortcomings in this area of the literature. Firstly, the gold stock exchange was not fully fledged in Vietnam until recently. Hence, the gold price is collected from the unofficial market thus, the empirical result could be impacted by this uncertainty. Secondly, the State Bank of Vietnam does not officially set an inflation target as used by Lai (2012). Therefore, we do not include these variables in our model. Thirdly, previous studies impose the same value for the elasticity in case of appreciation and depreciation, in both the short and long terms.

III. Methodology

Symmetric specification

Bahmani-Oskooee, Halicioglu, and Bahmani (2017) explore the effects of exchange rate on money demand for the Turkish economy. They question the hypothesis that the exchange rate has only symmetrical effects on the money demand in the short run and in the long run. They found that the exchange rate has asymmetrical effects in the short run and in the long run for the Turkish economy. We are also inspired by the recent contributions of Bahmani-Oskooee and Aftab (2017, 2018); Bahmani-Oskooee and Nayeri (2018) to explore the determinants of money demand in Vietnam that can be explained by the nominal exchange rate,⁵ the gross domestic product, and the interest rate. We start with the specification of the symmetrical model and then we will describe the specification of the asymmetrical specification. Thus, we introduce the nominal exchange rate in the money demand equation:

⁴For expected inflation, her calculations were based on Gerlach and Svensson (2003).

⁵An alternative specification could use the trade-weighted nominal exchange rate as the explained variable. Nevertheless, we think that behaviours of economic agents are mainly driven by the nominal exchange rate vis-à-vis the U.S. in the case of the Vietnamese dong in a context of dollarization.

$$\begin{aligned} \ln M2D_t = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln NER_t + \beta_2 \ln GDP_t + \beta_3 IR3_t \\ & + \epsilon_t. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $M2D$ denotes the money demand for the local currency, NER stands for the nominal exchange rate (VND per USD),⁶ GDP stands for the Gross Domestic Product and $IR3$ is the 3-month deposit interest rate. The data used in this investigation and their sources are fully described in Table A1 and A2 in the appendix.

Following Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014), it is straightforward to write the error correction form for the linear ARDL model⁷

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln M2D_t = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln M2D_{t-1} + \beta_2 \ln NER_{t-1} \\ & + \beta_3 \ln GDP_{t-1} + \beta_4 IR3_{t-1} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \varphi_i \Delta \ln M2D_{t-i} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} (\gamma_{1j} \Delta \ln NER_{t-j} + \gamma_{2j} \Delta \ln GDP_{t-j} \\ & + \gamma_{3j} \Delta IR3_{t-j}) + v_t \\ = & \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \varphi_i \Delta \ln M2D_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} (\gamma_{1j} \Delta \ln NER_{t-j} \\ & + \gamma_{2j} \Delta \ln GDP_{t-j} + \gamma_{3j} \Delta IR3_{t-j}) \\ & + \beta_1 \xi_{t-1} + v \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where ξ_t is the error-correction term.

Asymmetric specification

Bahmani-Oskooee and Bahmani (2015) are the first to estimate the asymmetric effects of exchange rate on money demand. By employing the approach of Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014), we decompose the exchange rate into asymmetric effects: the partial sums of positive and negative changes of the exchange rate indicating a depreciation for the Vietnamese

dong (with a positive superscript) and appreciation for the Vietnamese dong (with a negative superscript). This empirical approach has been used for China by Bahmani-Oskooee et al. (2016), for African countries by Bahmani-Oskooee and Gelan (2019) and for several emerging countries Bahmani-Oskooee et al. (2019).

We defined these partial sums for nominal exchange rate changes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln NER_t^+ &= \sum_{j=1}^t \Delta \ln NER_j^+ = \sum_{j=1}^t \max(\Delta \ln NER_j, 0). \\ \ln NER_t^- &= \sum_{j=1}^t \Delta \ln NER_j^- = \sum_{j=1}^t \min(\Delta \ln NER_j, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To explore the asymmetric linkages between the exchange rate and money demand,⁸ we employ the approaches of Schorderet (2003) and of Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014) to formulate 4 different cases: (i) the long-run and short-run asymmetry; (ii) only long-run asymmetry; (iii) only short-run asymmetry; and (iv) the symmetry that corresponds to the linear ARDL as specified in equation (2).

Long-run and short-run asymmetry

The long-run and short-run asymmetry of exchange rate on money demand can be expressed as follows⁹

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln M2D_t = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln M2D_{t-1} + \beta_2^+ \ln NER_{t-1}^+ \\ & + \beta_2^- \ln NER_{t-1}^- + \beta_3 \ln GDP_{t-1} + \beta_4 IR3_{t-1} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^p \varphi_i \Delta \ln M2D_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^q (\gamma_{1i}^+ \Delta \ln NER_{t-i}^+ \\ & + \gamma_{2i}^- \Delta \ln NER_{t-i}^- + \gamma_{3i} \Delta \ln GDP_{t-i} + \gamma_{4i} \Delta IR3_{t-i}) \\ & + v_t. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Where $L_{ner^+} = \frac{-\beta_2^+}{\beta_1}$ and $L_{ner^-} = \frac{-\beta_2^-}{\beta_1}$ are the long run coefficients of positive and negative changes of the exchange rate to the money demand. The

⁶An increase in NER indicates a depreciation of the Vietnamese dong.

⁷The error correction form for the nonlinear model can be found in equation (2.7) of Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014). The explanatory variables are split into positive partial sums and negative partial sums in order to capture asymmetric effects.

⁸This approach has been employed in Delatte and López-Villavicencio (2012) to investigate the asymmetric effects of exchange rate on prices in four major industrial countries. In addition, Konopczak (2019) argues that the incompleteness of exchange rate pass-through is a statistical artefact thanks to a threshold NARDL model.

⁹There are other possibilities for the nonlinear specification as underlined by Karamelikli and Karimi (2020). In Table 4, the symmetry tests indicate that the asymmetrical effects occur in the short run and in the long run. Thus, the specifications for (i) short run symmetry/long run asymmetry and (ii) short run asymmetry/long run symmetry are not presented.

positive and negative superscripts stand for the partial sums of positive and negative changes of the nominal exchange rate. Besides, $L_{gdp} = \frac{-\beta_3}{\beta_1}$, $L_{ir3} = \frac{-\beta_4}{\beta_1}$ are the long-run coefficients of the GDP and of the interest rate.

To test the existence of co-integration, Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (2001) propose the *bounds test* that is a joint test on all the lagged values of explanatory variables in levels. There are two tests: *t*-statistic of Banerjee, Dolado, and Mestre (1998) and *F*-statistic of Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (2001). Firstly, the *t*-statistic tests the null hypothesis of $\beta_1 = 0$ against the alternative hypothesis $\beta_1 < 0$. Secondly, the *F*-statistic tests the null hypothesis of $\beta_1 = \beta_2^+ = \beta_2^- = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 0$ for the case of long-run asymmetry, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 0$ in case of linear ARDL. The lower bound critical values are computed under the hypothesis that all the variables are stationary, whereas the upper critical values are calculated under the hypothesis that all the variables are non-stationary. If *F*-statistic is higher than the upper bound critical value, we reject the null hypothesis of no co-integration; thus, we accept the existence of a long-run relationship.

The long-run symmetry hypothesis can be tested by the *Wald test* of the null hypothesis of $L_{ner+} = L_{ner-}$; to test the existence of short-run symmetry, we use the *Wald test* to test the null hypothesis of $\sum_{i=0}^q \gamma_{1i}^+ = \sum_{i=0}^q \gamma_{1i}^-$. The rejection of the null hypothesis of symmetry indicates that we should use a specification allowing asymmetric effect of the nominal exchange rate (*NER*) on the money demand (*M2D*) in the short and/or the long run.¹⁰

Dynamic multipliers

When the null hypothesis of symmetry is rejected, we can obtain the asymmetric dynamic multipliers of the change of positive and negative variations of the explanatory variables. Here, these asymmetric dynamic multipliers capture the impact of nominal

appreciation and nominal depreciation on the money demand. As explained before, there is no reason to expect that nominal appreciation and nominal depreciation will have the same effect on money demand. We can use the following formulas to compute the asymmetric dynamic multipliers:

$$m_h^+ = \sum_{j=0}^h \frac{\partial \ln M2D_{t+j}}{\partial \ln NER_t^+}$$

$$m_h^- = \sum_{j=0}^h \frac{\partial \ln M2D_{t+j}}{\partial \ln NER_t^-} \quad (5)$$

By construction, when $h \rightarrow \infty$, $m_h^+ \rightarrow L_{ner+}$ and $m_h^- \rightarrow L_{ner-}$. These dynamic multipliers could capture the cumulative effects of nominal depreciation and nominal appreciation on the money demand from an initial equilibrium to the new equilibrium¹¹ as shown by Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014).

IV. Results

Unit root tests

Even though the methodology used in this paper allows for a mixture of stationary *I*(0) series and non-stationary *I*(1) series in the estimation of the error correction model, according to Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014), we must verify that all variables are really a mixture of *I*(0) series and *I*(1) series. Indeed, we need at least two non-stationary *I*(1) series in the model, and we have to exclude the non-stationary *I*(2) series (i.e. a series that needs to be differenced twice to be stationary). To this end, we test the levels and the first differences with the Dicky-Fuller GLS and the Phillips-Perron tests as recommended by Philips (2018) and Jordan and Philips (2018). The results are shown in Table 1. As the unit root tests indicate that the variables are non-stationary *I*(1) series, we can move to the next step and estimate an ARDL model as specified in equation (2) and an NARDL model as described in equation (4).

¹⁰Pal and Mitra (2016) implement an augmented version of the NARDL model with both symmetric and asymmetric regressors in an empirical investigation about the transmission from crude to oil product prices in India. Besides, they found that the use of a multiple threshold NARDL model (MTNARDL) improves precision in estimating asymmetric effects.

¹¹Even though asymmetric error correction is not explicitly modelled by allowing regime dependency for β_1 , we may still observe asymmetric adjustment trajectories thanks to the asymmetric dynamic multipliers. Alternatively, we could use a time-varying regression model based on the Kalman filter as in Jelassi, Trabelsi, and Turki (2017) and Sidiropoulos, Trabelsi, and Karfakis (2005).

Table 1. Unit root test.

Levels						
	<i>LnM2D</i>	<i>LnNER</i>	<i>LnGDP</i>	<i>IR3</i>	<i>LnNER⁺</i>	<i>LnNER⁻</i>
PP	-1.785	-0.363	-2.410	-2.232	-0.105	0.492
DF-GLS	-1.552	-1.347	-1.751	-1.690	-1.643	-1.459
First differences						
	ΔLnM2D	ΔLnNER	ΔLnGDP	ΔIR3	ΔLnNER^+	ΔLnNER^-
PP	-11.887*	-8.292*	-6.846*	-5.964*	-7.681*	-8.105*
DF-GLS	-3.579*	-4.470*	-1.831	-6.515*	-4.022*	-5.934*

Note: * $p < 0.05$. All the variables are augmented with three lags in the PP test. In these tests, statistical significance amounts to stationarity.
Source: author's calculations.

Short run dynamics

As we can observe in Figure B1 and B2 in Appendix B, during the period spanning from the last quarter of 2000 to the first quarter of 2018, the Vietnamese dong underwent large episodes of continuous depreciation against the U.S. dollar (up to 13 quarters). This opens the possibility for testing whether past exchange rate variations (above 4 quarters) have had an effect on the dynamics of money demand. We implement a general-to-specific approach to choose the optimal lag order for the ARDL model and the NARDL model. First, we choose the largest model with the best combination of the following statistics: the lowest AIC, the lowest RMSE, and the highest error-correction term. This gives an ARDL(7,7) for the symmetric specification and an ARDL(2,12) for the asymmetric model.¹² Second, we use a backward stepwise selection procedure based on the AIC to obtain our final models presented in Tables 2 and 3.

On the one hand, in the ARDL model, the short-run coefficients of the nominal exchange rate are positive and statistically significant at the 1% level except for the first dynamic lag as we can see in Panel A of Table 2. These positive signs could indicate that the wealth effect dominates the substitution effect in the short run. We will come back to these two effects in the next section. Besides, three out of five short-run coefficients for the gross domestic product are positive and statistically significant. These positive signs are expected and reflect that domestic residents need more money to achieve a higher level of

transaction (i.e. the transaction motive). Finally, the dynamic lags for the interest rate are not significant.

On the other hand, in the NARDL model, nine out of 12 short-term coefficients for positive partial sums of the nominal exchange rate are positive and significant at the 5% level¹³ as we can note in Panel A of Table 3. Again, this could imply that wealth effects dominate substitution effects in case of nominal depreciation (see the Panel A of Figure B2 in Appendix), but only in the short run. Thus, a nominal depreciation leads to an increase in money demand. Since the domestic residents observe an increase in the value of foreign currency, the consumption increases. As we will see in the following section, the transition to the new equilibrium will change the relative importance of these two effects. For the negative partial sums of the nominal exchange rate, five out of 12 are positive and significant at the 5% level. This could indicate, again, that wealth effects dominate substitution effects in the short run. Indeed, a nominal appreciation will lead to a reduction in the value of foreign currency. Finally, this reduction will lead to a lower level of consumption.

Long run dynamics

In Tables 2 and 3, we estimate the symmetric and asymmetric effects of the exchange rate on the money demand for the Vietnamese economy. At first glance, we can see that the long-run coefficients are correctly signed and are statistically significant at the 1% level. In the Panel B of Table 2,

¹²We do not include dynamic lags for the other variables for two reasons: first, our variables of interest are the positive and negative partial sums of the nominal exchange rate and, second, to preserve degrees of freedom. Nevertheless, when we introduce dynamic lags for the gross domestic product and the interest rate, these last variables are not statistically significant and do not improve the AIC or the RMSE.

¹³Except for the first dynamic lag that has a negative sign.

Table 2. Symmetric specification for the money demand equation (ARDL).

Panel A: Short-run coefficient estimates							
	Lag Order						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
ΔLnM2D			−0.24** (0.12)	−0.37*** (0.13)	−0.16 (0.12)		
ΔLnNER		1.47 (0.99)	4.79*** (0.97)	5.56*** (1.20)	3.84*** (1.17)	3.35*** (1.19)	6.11*** (1.15)
ΔLnGDP	10.75*** (2.52)		4.42 (2.71)	8.01*** (2.45)		4.22 (2.68)	8.44*** (3.09)
ΔIR3	−0.02 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)					
Panel B: Cointegration vector (ECM form)							
Constant	LnNER_{t-1}	LnGDP_{t-1}	IR3_{t-1}				
11.93*** (2.03)	−3.52*** (0.51)	2.08*** (0.28)	−0.03*** (0.01)				
Panel C: Long-run coefficient estimates							
L_{ner}	L_{gdp}	L_{ir3}					
−3.74***	2.21***	−0.03***					
Panel D: Diagnostic statistics							
ECM	Adj. R2	RMSE	AIC	Obs.			
−0.94*** (0.11)	0.62	0.0843	−116.38	63			

Notes: standard errors in parentheses. The symbols ***, ** and * correspond to statistical significance at 1, 5 and 10%, respectively. We use quarterly data over the period spanning from the third quarter of 2000 to the first quarter of 2018 ($N = 70$). The value of the dynamic multipliers is obtained thanks to bootstrapping techniques described in Philips (2018) that perform well in small samples.

Source: authors' calculations.

Table 3. Asymmetric specification for the money demand equation (NARDL).

Panel A: Short-run coefficient estimates						
	Lag Order					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
ΔLnNER^+	−3.14** (1.43)	4.53** (1.83)	7.52*** (1.61)	7.85*** (1.57)	7.66*** (1.84)	5.55*** (1.84)
ΔLnNER^-	0.97 (5.45)	13.85* (7.91)	15.23 (9.12)	12.46 (8.37)	17.46** (7.16)	21.02*** (7.43)
ΔLnNER^+	6 4.41** (1.60)	7 1.79 (1.54)	8 6.66*** (1.60)	9 3.64** (1.64)	10 4.99*** (1.69)	11 3.65* (1.89)
ΔLnNER^-	35.39*** (6.48)	22.27*** (7.14)	10.16 (6.69)	8.17 (6.20)	13.59* (7.48)	6.03 (5.67)
Panel B: Cointegration vector (ECM form)						
Constant	LnNER_{t-1}^+	LnNER_{t-1}^-	LnGDP_{t-1}	IR3_{t-1}		
−40.95*** (7.52)	−8.60*** (1.68)	−18.26** (6.96)	3.74*** (0.67)	−0.04*** (0.01)		
Panel C: Long-run coefficient estimates						
L_{ner}^+	L_{ner}^-	L_{gdp}	L_{ir3}			
−7.39***	−15.69***	3.22***	−0.03***			
Panel D: Diagnostic statistics						
ECM	Adj. R2	RMSE	AIC	Obs.		
−1.16*** (0.20)	0.65	0.0827	−106.91	58		

Notes: standard errors in parentheses. The symbols ***, ** and * correspond to statistical significance at 1, 5 and 10%, respectively. We use quarterly data over the period spanning from the third quarter of 2000 to the first quarter of 2018 ($N = 70$). The value of the confidence intervals for the difference between asymmetric cumulative dynamic multipliers is obtained thanks to bootstrapping techniques described in Shin, Yu, and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014) that perform well in small samples.

Source: authors' calculations.

the nominal exchange rate elasticity to money demand is equal to 3.74%. Consequently, a nominal appreciation of 1% increases the money demand by 3.74% in the long run. This empirical result indicates that the substitution effect dominates the wealth. Indeed, when we observe a nominal appreciation, the value of foreign currency expressed in local currency drops. Facing this negative wealth effect, domestic residents will reduce their consumption; consequently, they need less money for their transactions. However, this negative wealth effect can be more than offset by a substitution effect as the domestic residents will be less prone to acquire assets in dollars to protect themselves from adverse exchange rate variation. In addition, we can note that these results fall within the range found in Lai (2012), as she found an elasticity between 3.1% and 6% for various monetary aggregates.

As the long-run coefficients are negative, we can conclude that after an appreciation of the Vietnamese dong (i.e. a depreciation of the U.S. dollar), the domestic money demand will grow, as the substitution effect is stronger than the wealth effect. This is confirmed by the results of the NARDL model (Panel B of Table 3) where episodes of negative changes in the nominal exchange rate (i.e. a nominal appreciation) have a positive effect on the money demand in the long term. Here, the long-run elasticity is equal to -15.69 . At the same time, episodes of positive changes in the nominal exchange rate (i.e. a nominal depreciation) have a negative effect on the money demand in the long term with an elasticity of -7.39 . These results suggest that the substitution effect dominates the wealth effect in the long term. Interestingly, a nominal appreciation has a higher elasticity than a nominal depreciation. We will come back to this point in the next section.

For the gross domestic product variable, in Panel B of Table 2, the long-run elasticities are positive and significant at the 1-% level in the ARDL specification and in the NARDL specification. These results suggest that higher income increases the money demand for transaction purposes. Besides,

the values of the long-run elasticities are 2.21 and 3.22 for the ARDL model and for the NARDL model, respectively. These results are close to those of previous studies on the symmetric specification. For the income elasticity, Lai (2012) found values around 1.5 and Nguyen and Pfau (2010) found values slightly above 2.5.

For the interest rate variable, in Panel B of Table 2, the long run coefficients are negative and significant at the 1% level in the ARDL specifications. We found a long-run coefficient of -0.03 for the ARDL and NARDL models. These results suggest the existence of an intertemporal substitution effect. Indeed, an increase in the 3-month deposit rate decreases the money demand because domestic residents will substitute present consumption by future consumption. Furthermore, our results are close to those of Nguyen and Pfau (2010) who found a long-run coefficient of -0.02 for the interest rate variable.

Coefficient diagnostics

To validate our error-correction model, we need to test whether a long-term relationship exists or not. To this end, we implement the t-test of Banerjee, Dolado, and Mestre (1998) and *F*-statistic of Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (2001). In Table 4, we can clearly see that the t-statistic is below the critical value at the 1% level and that the *F*-statistic is above the critical value at the 1% level for the ARDL and the NARDL models. Based on these results, we have relatively strong evidence of cointegration.

Then, we test the possible existence of asymmetry in the short term and in the long term in Table 4 as specified in (4). We find that the null hypothesis of short run symmetry is rejected at the 1% level, but the null hypothesis of long run symmetry is rejected only at the 10% level. In addition, autocorrelation,¹⁴ heteroscedasticity and normality tests indicate that the residuals of the ARDL and of the NARDL specification are not affected by severe problems of autocorrelation, heteroscedasticity or non-normality. Except for the residuals of

¹⁴To test auto-correlation, we use the more versatile framework for the tests of Cumby and Huizinga (1992) implemented by Baum, Schaffer, and Stillman (2007).

Table 4. Cointegration tests, symmetry tests and diagnostic tests.

Tests	ARDL	NARDL
t_{BMD}	-8.69***	-5.72***
F_{PSS}	21.02***	11.27***
LR symmetry test		3.11*
SR symmetry test		7.90***
C-H test for autocorrelation (L-B) (1 to 6/1 to 12)	0.07 [0.79]	4.46 [0.61]
LM test for ARCH (6/12)	2.41 [0.87]	14.20 [0.28]
Shapiro-Wilk W test	0.95 [0.03]	0.99 [0.98]


Notes: t_{BMD} denotes the t-statistic of Banerjee, Dolado, and Mestre (1998) and F_{PSS} is the F-statistic of Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (2001). The p-values are in brackets. The upper bound critical values for the F-test in case of unrestricted intercept, no trend for $k = 4$, $N = 67$ is 5.57 (5.285 when $k = 5$) at the 1% level (Narayan 2005). Moreover, the upper bound critical values for the t-test in case of unrestricted intercept, no trend for $k = 4$, $N = 67$ is -4.60 (-4.790 when $k = 5$) at the 1% level, but, here, asymptotic critical values are used.

Source: authors' calculations.

the ARDL model that do not seem to be normally distributed as shown by the p-value of the Shapiro–Wilk W test, but this may be due to a unique outlier as we can see in Panel C of Figure C1 in Appendix.

In the two specifications, the error correction terms are close to unity. For the ARDL model, in Table 2, the confidence interval spans from -0.72 to -1.16 at 95% level. Besides, in the NARDL model (see Table 3), the error correction term is above unity indicating oscillatory convergence as explained by Loayza and Ranciere (2006) in a panel setting. In Figure 1, we can see that the model tends to oscillate after a nominal appreciation of 1%. Ultimately, the model reaches a new equilibrium when the oscillations become indistinguishable from the naked eye.

Indeed, the dynamic multipliers up to 60 quarters are presented in Figure 1. They are based on the ARDL and the NARDL specifications described in equations (2) and (4). We can see that the new long-run equilibrium for the money demand after a symmetric or asymmetric shock is not reached monotonically. Instead of converging monotonically, the error-correction process oscillates around the new long-run equilibrium in a dampening manner as underlined by Narayan and Smyth (2006). Once the process is complete, the convergence to the equilibrium is fast.¹⁵ When the shock is symmetric (i.e. a permanent nominal appreciation of 1%), the money demand increases by 3.7% in the long term. On the one hand, when the shock is asymmetric, for a permanent nominal appreciation of 1%, we observe an increase of 15.6% for the money demand. On the other hand, for a permanent nominal depreciation of

**Figure 1.** Dynamic multipliers

Note: In the symmetric model, the shock corresponds to a permanent appreciation of the Vietnamese currency. The mean value before the shock is equal to 4.76. The confidence intervals have been obtained through bootstrapping procedures using 100 replications. Source: authors' calculations.

1%, we observe a decrease of 7.4% for the money demand. These results are consistent with symmetry tests and lead us to think that asymmetries occur mainly in the short run and are transmitted to the long run.

Note: the upper panels A and B display stability tests for the ARDL model and the lower panels C and D display stability tests for the NARDL model. Source: authors' calculations.

Finally, we test the stability of the money demand in Figure 2. Indeed, we use two different tests for the ARDL and the NARDL specifications. The first one is based on the cumulative sum of OLS residuals and the second one is constructed

¹⁵As suggested by Johansen (1995), with a simple example of a bivariate cointegrated VAR(1), a stability condition for an error-correction model is that the error-correction term must be strictly inferior to zero and strictly superior to -2. Indeed, the error-correction model can be written as an AR(1) process for the disequilibrium error.




Figure 2. Stability tests for the ARDL and NARDL specifications

with the cumulative sum of recursive residuals. As we can see, the coefficients for the two specifications describing the dynamics of money demand seem to be stable over the sample period.

V. Conclusion

In the recent modified circular No. 42/2018/TT-NHNN of 1 October 2019, the SBV announces a series of new measures to prohibit foreign currency loans for credit institutions and foreign bank branches in both the short and the long term. These measures aim at limiting the dollarization of the Vietnamese economy. Indeed, the dollarization of this economy could increase the vulnerability to international shocks as shown by the Asian financial crisis of 1997. Consequently, the SBV pursues its de-dollarization policy to limit the role of the U.S. dollar and foreign currencies in the domestic economy. This may induce an increase in domestic prices relative to foreign prices (as borrowing costs for firms will be higher), but this negative effect could be more than offset by the benefits reaped from a higher

economic stability and economic resilience to external shocks.

In this context, the objective of this empirical investigation is to examine the effect of exchange rate variations on the demand for money in Vietnam. In our empirical approach, we use linear and nonlinear error-correction models (i.e. ARDL and NARDL models) that may capture symmetric and asymmetric effects of nominal exchange rate variations on the money demand. Indeed, there are no a priori reasons that nominal depreciation and nominal appreciation will have the same impact on the money demand.

In the linear and the nonlinear specifications, our results show that the substitution effect always dominates the wealth effect in the long run. Facing a nominal depreciation, domestic residents will acquire and hold more foreign currency to protect themselves from adverse exchange rate variations. Thus, the domestic money demand decreases. Consequently, this empirical result could help to understand the dollarization of the economy. Whereas during a nominal appreciation, domestic

residents will acquire and hold less foreign currency as the value expressed in foreign currency of the Vietnamese dong increases. Thus, the domestic money demand grows, leading to de-dollarization.

As stated before, our study opens the possibility to explore asymmetric effects. Indeed, when the shock is symmetric (i.e. a permanent nominal appreciation of 1%), the money demand increases by 3.7% in the long term. On the one hand, when the shock is asymmetric, for a permanent nominal appreciation of 1%, we observe an increase of 15.6% for the money demand. On the other hand, for a permanent nominal depreciation of 1%, we observe a decrease of 7.4% for the money demand.

These empirical results could help to improve the understanding of the linkages between monetary policy and exchange policy in a context of dollarization for the Vietnamese economy. It seems to indicate that de-dollarization policies could be implemented as the long-run elasticity is two times higher in case of nominal appreciation than in case of nominal depreciation. Finally, these asymmetries could be explored with econometric models that allow regime switching for the error-correction term. We leave this for future research.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Fredj Jawadi and Naveen Kumar for their very relevant comments and remarks during the 6th International Symposium in Computational Economics and Finance which took place on the 29th-30 October 2020 in Paris. We also thank the organizers and all the participants of this conference. This work has benefitted from very valuable comments and remarks by Bertrand Koebel and from proof-reading by Katharina Friedl. We are grateful to anonymous referees for useful suggestions on the literature. Sy-Hoa Ho gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the National Foundation for Science and Technology Development of Vietnam (NAFOSTED). All errors or omissions are ours.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Sy-Hoa Ho  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8936-8589>

Jamel Saadaoui  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1143-4480>

References

- Aizenman, J., and H. Ito. 2014. "Living with the Trilemma Constraint: Relative Trilemma Policy Divergence, Crises, and Output Losses for Developing Countries." *Journal of International Money and Finance* 49: 28–51. doi:10.1016/j.jimonfin.2014.05.005.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., and M. Aftab. 2017. "On the Asymmetric Effects of Exchange Rate Volatility on Trade Flows: New Evidence from US-Malaysia Trade at the Industry Level." *Economic Modelling* 63: 86–103. doi:10.1016/j.econmod.2017.02.004.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., and M. Aftab. 2018. "Asymmetric Effects of Exchange Rate Changes on the Malaysia-China Commodity Trade." *Economic Systems* 42 (3): 470–486. doi:10.1016/j.ecosys.2017.11.004.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., and S. Bahmani. 2015. "Nonlinear ARDL Approach and the Demand for Money in Iran." *Economics Bulletin* 35 (1): 381–391.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., S. Bahmani, A. M. Kutan, and D. Xi. 2019. "On the Asymmetric Effects of Exchange Rate Changes on the Demand for Money: Evidence from Emerging Economies." *Journal of Emerging Market Finance* 18 (1): 1–22. doi:10.1177/0972652719831523.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., and S. Chomsisengphet. 2002. "Stability of M2 Money Demand Function in Industrial Countries." *Applied Economics* 34 (16): 2075–2083. doi:10.1080/00036840210128744.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., and A. Gelan. 2019. "Asymmetric Effects of Exchange Rate Changes on the Demand for Money in Africa." *Applied Economics* 51 (31): 3365–3375. doi:10.1080/00036846.2019.1578854.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., F. Halicioglu, and S. Bahmani. 2017. "Do Exchange Rate Changes Have Symmetric or Asymmetric Effects on the Demand for Money in Turkey?" *Applied Economics* 49 (42): 4261–4270. doi:10.1080/00036846.2017.1279271.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., A. M. Kutan, and D. Xi. 2013. "The Impact of Economic and Monetary Uncertainty on the Demand for Money in Emerging Economies." *Applied Economics* 45 (23): 3278–3287. doi:10.1080/00036846.2012.705430.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., and M. M. Nayeri. 2018. "Policy Uncertainty and the Demand for Money in Australia: An Asymmetry Analysis." *Australian Economic Papers* 57 (4): 456–469. doi:10.1111/1467-8454.12127.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., and H. Rehman. 2005. "Stability of the Money Demand Function in Asian Developing Countries." *Applied Economics* 37 (7): 773–792. doi:10.1080/0003684042000337424.
- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., D. Xi, and S. Bahmani. 2016. "Asymmetric Effects of Exchange Rate Changes on the Demand for Money in China." *Applied Economics Letters* 23 (15): 1104–1109.

- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., D. Xi, and S. Bahmani. 2019. "More Evidence on the Asymmetric Effects of Exchange Rate Changes on the Demand for Money: Evidence from Asian Countries." *Applied Economics Letters* 26 (6): 485–495. doi:10.1080/13504851.2018.1486979.
- Balke, N., and T. Fomby. 1997. "Threshold Cointegration." *International Economic Review* 38 (3): 627–645. doi:10.2307/2527284.
- Banerjee, A., J. Dolado, and R. Mestre. 1998. "Error-correction Mechanism Tests for Cointegration in a Single-equation Framework." *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 19 (3): 267–283. doi:10.1111/1467-9892.00091ISTEX.
- Baum, C., M. Schaffer, and S. Stillman. 2007. "Enhanced Routines for Instrumental Variables/generalized Method of Moments Estimation and Testing." *Stata Journal* 7 (4): 465–506. doi:10.1177/1536867X0800700402.
- Cumby, R. E., and J. Huizinga. 1992. "Testing the Autocorrelation Structure of Disturbances in Ordinary Least Squares and Instrumental Variables Regressions." *Econometrica* 60 (1): 185–195. doi:10.2307/2951684.
- Delatte, A.-L., and A. López-Villavicencio. 2012. "Asymmetric Exchange Rate Pass-through: Evidence from Major Countries." *Journal of Macroeconomics* 34 (3): 833–844. doi:10.1016/j.jmacro.2012.03.003.
- Dreger, C., and J. Wolters. 2010. "Investigating M3 Money Demand in the Euro Area." *Journal of International Money and Finance* 29 (1): 111–122. doi:10.1016/j.jimonfin.2009.02.002.
- Gerlach, S., and L. E. O. Svensson. 2003. "Money and Inflation in the Euro Area: A Case for Monetary Indicators?" *Journal of Monetary Economics* 50 (8): 1649–1672. doi:10.1016/j.jmoneco.2003.02.002.
- Granger, C., and G. Yoon. 2002. "Hidden Cointegration. Royal Economic Society Annual Conference 2002-92." *Royal Economic Society* 92.
- Jelassi, M. M., J. Trabelsi, and M. Turki. 2017. "Does the J-curve Hypothesis Hold for a Small Open Economy? Evidence from Time-varying Coefficients of a Distributed-lag Model for Tunisia." *International Economics* 152: 107–115. doi:10.1016/j.inteco.2017.06.002.
- Johansen, S. 1995. *Likelihood-based Inference in Cointegrated Vector Auto-regressive Models*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, S., and A. Q. Philips. 2018. "Cointegration Testing and Dynamic Simulations of Autoregressive Distributed Lag Models." *The Stata Journal* 18 (4): 902–923. doi:10.1177/1536867X1801800409.
- Karamelikli, H., and M. S. Karimi. 2020. "Asymmetric Relationship between Interest Rates and Exchange Rates: Evidence from Turkey." *International Journal of Finance & Economics* n/a(n/a). doi:10.1002/ijfe.2213.
- Konopczak, K. 2019. "Can Inaction Account for the Incomplete Exchange Rate Pass-through? Evidence from Threshold ARDL Model." *Baltic Journal of Economics* 19 (2): 276–295. doi:10.1080/1406099X.2019.1654223.
- Lai, N.-A. (2012). "Stability of Money Demand in Vietnam: Application of the Bounds Testing Approach on 1999-2011." Working paper, Pantheon-Sorbonne University.
- Loayza, N. V., and R. Ranciere. 2006. "Financial Development, Financial Fragility, and Growth." *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 38 (4): 1051–1076. doi:10.1353/mcb.2006.0060.
- Mundell, R. A. 1960. "The Monetary Dynamics of International Adjustment under Fixed and Flexible Exchange Rates." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 74 (2): 227–257. doi:10.2307/1884252ISTEX.
- Mundell, R. A. 1963. "Capital Mobility and Stabilization Policy under Fixed and Flexible Exchange Rates." *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 29 (4): 475–485. doi:10.2307/139336.
- Narayan, P. K. 2005. "The Saving and Investment Nexus for China: Evidence from Cointegration Tests." *Applied Economics* 37 (17): 1979–1990. doi:10.1080/00036840500278103.
- Narayan, P. K., and R. Smyth. 2006. "What Determines Migration Flows from Low-income to High-income Countries? An Empirical Investigation of Fiji-U.S. Migration." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 24 (2): 332–342. doi:10.1093/cep/byj019ISTEX.
- Nguyen, H. D., and W. D. Pfau (2010). "The Determinants and Stability of Real Money Demand in Vietnam, 1999-2009." Working paper, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies.
- Pal, D., and S. K. Mitra. 2016. "Asymmetric Oil Product Pricing in India: Evidence from a Multiple Threshold Nonlinear ARDL Model." *Economic Modelling* 59: 314–328. doi:10.1016/j.econmod.2016.08.003.
- Pesaran, M. H., Y. Shin, and R. J. Smith. 2001. "Bounds Testing Approaches to the Analysis of Level Relationships." *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 16 (3): 289–326. doi:10.1002/jae.616ISTEX.
- Pham, D. L., and Q. H. Bui. 2018. "Determinants and Stability of Demand for Money in Vietnam." In *Econometrics for Financial Applications*, edited by L. H. Anh, L. S. Dong, V. Kreinovich, and N. N. Thach, 712–726, Springer International Publishing: Springer.
- Philips, A. Q. 2018. "Have Your Cake and Eat It Too? Cointegration and Dynamic Inference from Autoregressive Distributed Lag Models." *American Journal of Political Science* 62 (1): 230–244. doi:10.1111/ajps.12318.
- Schorderet, Y. (2003). "Asymmetric Cointegration." Working paper, University of Geneva.
- Shin, Y., B. Yu, and M. Greenwood-Nimmo. 2014. "Modelling Asymmetric Cointegration and Dynamic Multipliers in a Nonlinear ARDL Framework." In *Festschrift in Honor of Peter Schmidt*, edited by R. Sickles and W. C. Horrace, 281–314, Springer-Verlag New York: Springer.
- Sidiropoulos, M., J. Trabelsi, and C. Karfakis. 2005. "Has the 'Franc Fort' Exchange Rate Policy Affected the Inflationary Dynamics? Theory and New Evidence." *International Economic Journal* 19 (3): 379–395. doi:10.1080/10168730500199400.

Appendix

Appendix A. Data description

Table A1. Definition of the data

Variable	Definition
<i>M2D</i>	Money supply (M2) minus net foreign assets at constant prices in VND.
<i>NER</i>	Nominal exchange rate (e VND = 1 USD).
<i>GDP</i>	GDP at constant prices and seasonally adjusted (X12) in VND.
<i>IR3</i>	3-month deposit rate in percent as the average of 3 month deposit rates at the end of period from four large state-owned commercial banks.

Table A2. Source of the data

Variable	Source
<i>M2D</i>	State Bank of Vietnam (SBV), Reuters, own calculations.
<i>NER</i>	Reuters.
<i>GDP</i>	General Statistics Office of Vietnam (GSO), own calculations.
<i>IR3</i>	Reuters.

Appendix B. Partial sums






Figure B1. Nominal exchange rate

Note: An increase in the NER represents a depreciation of the Vietnamese currency. Source: authors' calculations.



(Panel A)



(Panel B)

Figure B2. Positive and negative partial sums
Source: authors' calculations.

Appendix C. Residuals normality




Figure C1. Residual plots for the ARDL and NARDL specifications

Note: the left-hand side panels display residuals of the ARDL model and the right-hand side panels display residuals of the NARDL model. Source: authors' calculations.