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Evolution of Exchange Rate Regimes in Transition Economies

- Early transition, preferred monetary strategy
  - exchange rate pegging
    - Weak or absent financial markets
    - Undeveloped market institutions
    - Deficient knowledge for conducting monetary policy
- Initial success
  - Inflation reduced
  - Credibility improved
- Different subsequent choices by transition economies
  - Several switched to more flexible ER systems
  - Many stuck to fixed ER systems
    - Widespread “fear of floating”
Volatility (SD) of exchange rates and foreign exchange reserves for transition countries versus Euro area (Germany) and Japan, January 1995 – December 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>SD of exchange rate</th>
<th>SD of foreign exchange reserves</th>
<th>Ratio of SD of foreign exchange reserves to SD of exchange rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.44 (1.89)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (Euro area)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determinants of “Fear of Floating” in Transition Economies

1. **Openness** (imports plus exports as a share of GDP) (average for 1995-2007)
   - Transition countries: 106% (↑17 p.p.)
   - Developed countries: 74% (↑7 p.p.)

2. **Euroisation**
   - High share of foreign currency deposits in total deposits - between 10% in Czech Republic and over 80% in Croatia ([Figure](#))

   - Higher openness + euroisation ⇒ higher exchange rate pass-through (ERPT)!

   - **Concern to the transition countries:**
     - Variability of nominal ER ⇒ Variability of domestic prices
     - The higher the ERPT, the higher the variability of domestic prices
     - Inconsistent with price stability

   - **Meta-regression analysis to inform policy**
Foreign currency deposits as a share of total deposits in transition countries 1995-2007

- **Average level of euroisation during 1995-2007**
- **Highest level of euroisation during 1995-2007**

Countries: Czech R., Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Albania, Slovenia, Lithuania, Romania, Latvia, Bulgaria, Bosnia, Macedonia, Croatia
Meta-Regression Analysis

**Meta-regression analysis** used to investigate ERPT:

1. **Review of 24 econometric studies**
   - Typical primary study
     - Dependent variable: domestic prices
     - Independent of interest: nominal exchange rate

2. **Choice of effect size (dependent variable):**
   - t-values not available for each coefficient
   - Regression coefficients chosen
     - Typically ERPT estimated as a constant elasticity

3. **Data:**
   - 575 coefficients collected from 23 studies in total:
     - 448 for developed economies; 127 for transition economies
     - 202 for ERPT to import prices (IPI); 373 to consumer prices (CPI)
     - 331 for long-run ERPT; 244 for short-run ERPT
## Number of ERPT coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed countries</th>
<th>IPI Long run</th>
<th>Short run</th>
<th>CPI Long run</th>
<th>Short run</th>
<th>Transition countries</th>
<th>IPI Long run</th>
<th>Short run</th>
<th>CPI Long run</th>
<th>Short run</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Czech R.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model – Meta-Regression Analysis

\[ ERPTES_j = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_k Z_{jk} + u_j \]

- \( ERPTES_j \) is the effect size of ERPT;
- \( Z_{jk} \) are \( k \) moderator variables;
- \( \alpha_k \) are \( k \) meta-regression coefficients;
- \( j = 1, \ldots, 575 \) indexes the regressions estimating ERPT;
- \( k = 1, \ldots, K \) indexes the moderator variables (where \( K=12 \));
- \( u_j \) is the meta-regression disturbance term.
- Constant omitted

- Coefficients directly estimate ERPT for each category
## Results of the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression 1: OLS (robust SEs)</th>
<th>Regression 2: OLS (robust SEs)</th>
<th>Regression 3: Weighted and Cluster-robust Least Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Coef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR exchange rate pass-through to consumer prices in developed economies</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR exchange rate pass-through to consumer prices in transition economies</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR exchange rate pass-through to consumer prices in developed economies</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR exchange rate pass-through to consumer prices in transition economies</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR exchange rate pass-through to import prices in developed economies</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR exchange rate pass-through to import prices in transition economies</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR exchange rate pass-through to import prices in developed economies</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR exchange rate pass-through to import prices in transition economies</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients estimated by VAR models</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients estimated by OLS regressions</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients estimated from monthly data</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients estimated from quarterly data</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of freedom: 563

Degrees of freedom: 567

Degrees of freedom: 567
Results of the Model  (cont’d)

• Eight variables statistically significant
• Four variables statistically insignificant
  • Related to the type of methodology and data
  • Excluded in the parsimonious model

• Diagnostic tests
  • Linear functional form – well specified;
  • Normality – improved in parsimonious model;
  • Heteroscedasticity
    • White's heteroscedasticity adjusted standard errors

• Robustness checks
  • Cluster-robust SEs
  • Weighted
    • To give all studies equal influence
  • Estimates consistent

• Publication bias
  • The effects reported in the literature on ERPT are not unduly influenced by publication bias
ERPT is not complete even in the long run!

- Consumer prices
  - Developed economies - DEs (0.17)
  - Transition economies - TEs (0.51)
- Import prices
  - DEs (0.70)
  - TEs (0.60)

- Explanation
  - “Pricing to market” (Krugman, 1986)
  - Greater market power (Dornbusch, 1987).
Results of the Model (cont’d)

2 Stronger ERPT to import prices than to consumer prices!

- DEs: significant difference
  - Long-run – by 0.53 (0.70-0.17)
  - Short-run – by 0.47 (0.56-0.09)

- TEs: non-significant difference
  - Long-run – by 0.09 (0.60-0.51)
  - Short-run – by 0.07 (0.42-0.35)

- The wedge in DEs
  - Local distribution costs
  - Adjustment of profit margins
  - Share of non-tradables in the consumer price index

- Lack of such a wedge in TEs
  - Related to high levels of openness and euroisation
ERPT is higher in the long run than in the short run!

- Consumer prices
  - DEs – by 0.08 (0.17-0.09)
  - TEs – by 0.16 (0.51-0.35)
- Import prices
  - DEs – by 0.14 (0.70-0.56)
  - TEs – by 0.18 (0.60-0.42)
- Most of the differences
  - As anticipated
    - prices may be sticky in the short run and take time to adjust
  - Statistically significant
Results of the Model (cont’d)

4 Exchange rate change has similar effects on import prices in both developed and transition countries!

- Long-run
  - Higher in DEs – by 0.10 (0.70-0.60)
  - Not statistically significant difference
- Short-run
  - Higher in DEs – by 0.14 (0.56-0.42)
  - Not statistically significant difference
Results of the Model (cont’d)

5 ERPT to consumer prices is higher in TEs than in DEs!

- Long-run
  - Higher in TEs by 0.34 (0.51-0.17)
- Short-run
  - Higher in TEs by 0.26 (0.35-0.09)

- Both differences statistically significant
- Relatively high ERPT in TEs consistent with relatively high levels of
  - Openness
  - Euroisation

- Both establish a more direct link between exchange rate changes and price changes
Conclusion

- ERPT is not complete in the long run even in TEs
- However, lack of wedge in TEs between ERPT to import prices and to consumer prices …
- … and, higher ERPT to consumer prices in TEs than in DEs (on average, 3 times)

*Findings support the cautious exchange rate policies of many transition economies regarding exchange rate flexibility, because higher exchange rate variability may endanger the achievement of the main objective of monetary policy – stability of consumer prices.*