

# Intervention in the Foreign Exchange Market, Market Turnover and the Impact on Exchange and Interest Rate Dynamics in the Caribbean

By  
Dave Seerattan  
CCMF, UWI  
&  
Nicola Spagnolo  
Brunel University

41<sup>st</sup> Annual Monetary Studies  
Conference  
10-13 November 2009  
Bank of Guyana  
Georgetown, Guyana



SIXTIETH  
ANNIVERSARY

Dave.Seerattan@sta.uwi.edu  
www.ccmfuwi.org



CARIBBEAN CENTRE  
FOR MONEY & FINANCE

## **FORMAT OF PRESENTATION**

1. Introduction
2. Literature Review
3. Empirical Methodology
3. Results
4. Conclusions

# **INTRODUCTION - RATIONALE**

- **The Importance of Exchange Rate “Management” – Intervention, Policy Interest Rates**
- **The importance of the Policy Environment – Volume, Volatility and Market Structure**
- **The Need for Empirical Facts to Inform Intervention Policy**
- **The Observed Relation and Feedback Effects between Intervention and Monetary Variables**
- **The Increasing Frequency of Shocks and the Need to Manage Liquidity at a Daily Frequency**
- **The Need for a Joint Empirical framework to look at a number of issues Simultaneously**
- **The Rationale for Multivariate GARCH**

# **LITERATURE REVIEW – The Channel of Intervention**

- **Portfolio – Rebalancing of Agents' Portfolios (Galati and Melick 2002)**
- **Market Microstructure – Emits information which modify expectations and change order flows (Lyons 2001)**
- **Signalling – Signaling to agents the future stance of monetary Policy (Mussa 1981; Canales-Kriljenko et. Al. 2003)**

# **LITERATURE REVIEW – EMPIRICAL METHODS**

- **Good Reviews are Provided by Edison (1993) and Sarno and Taylor (2001)**
- **OLS Regression of means, risk premiums and order flow - Dominquez and Frankel (1993); Evans and Lyons (2002)**
- **Event Studies – Fatum (2000)**
- **GARCH – Dominquez (1998); Seerattan (2004)**
- **Markov Switching – Beine et.al. (2003); Seerattan and Spagnolo (2007)**
- **Multivariate GARCH – Beine (2004), Kim and Sheen (2006)**

# THE RATIONALE FOR THE MULTIVARIATE GARCH

- **Can Explore the Full Range of Relations and Feedback Effects**
- **Can Investigate the Impact of Policy on both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Moments**
- **Daily Data Used Since CBs Now Need to Respond on Daily Basis**
- **It Allows the Derivation of Conditional Covariance and Correlation of Important Variable Over Time –The Cost of Policy Conflicts Due to Unsynchronized Implementation of Related Policy Instruments**
- **The BEKK Parametization chosen – Reduces no. parameters to be estimated & covariance matrix will be positive semi-definite without additional restrictions being imposed**

# MULTIVARIATE GARCH - BEKK

$$H_{t+1} = C'C + A'\varepsilon_t\varepsilon_t'A + B'H_tB$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} & a_{14} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & a_{24} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} & a_{34} \\ a_{41} & a_{42} & a_{43} & a_{44} \end{bmatrix} \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} & b_{14} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & b_{23} & b_{24} \\ b_{31} & b_{32} & b_{33} & b_{34} \\ b_{41} & b_{42} & b_{43} & b_{44} \end{bmatrix} \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ c_{21} & c_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ c_{31} & c_{32} & c_{33} & 0 \\ c_{41} & c_{42} & c_{43} & c_{44} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h_{11,t+1} = & a_{11}^2 \varepsilon_{1,t}^2 + 2a_{11}a_{12} \varepsilon_{1,t} \varepsilon_{2,t} + 2a_{11}a_{31} \varepsilon_{1,t} \varepsilon_{3,t} \varepsilon_{3,t}^2 + 2a_{11}a_{41} \varepsilon_{1,t} \varepsilon_{4,t} \varepsilon_{4,t}^2 \\ & + a_{21}^2 \varepsilon_{2,t}^2 + 2a_{21}a_{31} \varepsilon_{2,t} \varepsilon_{3,t} + a_{31}^2 \varepsilon_{3,t}^2 + a_{31}^2 \varepsilon_{3,t}^2 + 2a_{31}a_{41} \varepsilon_{3,t} \varepsilon_{4,t} + a_{41}^2 \varepsilon_{4,t}^2 \\ & + b_{11}^2 h_{11,t} + 2b_{11}b_{12} h_{12,t} + 2b_{11}b_{31} h_{13,t} + 2b_{11}b_{41} h_{14,t} \\ & + b_{21}^2 h_{22,t} + 2b_{21}b_{31} h_{23,t} + 2b_{31}b_{41} h_{34,t} \\ & + b_{31}^2 h_{33,t} + 2b_{31}b_{41} h_{34,t} + b_{41}^2 h_{44,t} \end{aligned}$$

$$L(\theta) = -\frac{TN}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T (\ln |H_t| + \varepsilon_t' H_t^{-1} \varepsilon_t)$$

## MULTIVARIATE GARCH – MEAN EQUATIONS

$$ER_{1,t} = \delta_1 + \delta_{11}ER_{t-1} + \delta_{12}I_{t-1} + \delta_{13}RR_{t-1} + \delta_{14}MV_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{1,t}$$

$$I_{2,t} = \delta_2 + \delta_{21}ER_{t-1} + \delta_{22}I_{t-1} + \delta_{23}RR_{t-1} + \delta_{24}MV_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{2,t}$$

$$RR_{3,t} = \delta_3 + \delta_{31}ER_{t-1} + \delta_{32}I_{t-1} + \delta_{33}RR_{t-1} + \delta_{34}MV_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{3,t}$$

$$MV_{4,t} = \delta_4 + \delta_{41}ER_{t-1} + \delta_{42}I_{t-1} + \delta_{43}RR_{t-1} + \delta_{44}MV_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{4,t}$$



# EMPIRICS - DATA

- **Daily data**
- **Jamaica had 1162 Observations from Feb 7, 2002 To Sep 28, 2006 while T&T had 2393 Observations from Jan 3, 2000 To Sep 30, 2009**
- **Exchange rates Measured as the Intervention Currency per Domestic Currency – Variable used defined as  $100*\log(xrate/xrate\{1\})$**
- **Intervention measured as Daily Purchases and Sales of the Intervention Currency**
- **Interest rates used are the repo rate in Jamaica and the interbank rate in T&T- Variable used defined as  $100*\log(day180/day180\{1\})$**
- **Volume data is the daily sales and purchases of FC by the public**
- **All variables are I(0)**

Table 1: Estimated coefficients for the multivariate GARCH model for Jamaica

	<i>Exchange Rate (i=1)</i>		<i>Intervention (i=2)</i>		<i>Interest Rate (i=3)</i>		<i>Volume (i=4)</i>	
$\delta_{1i}$	-0.19	<u>-0.43</u>	0.019	<u>2.70</u>	-0.003	<u>-2.15</u>	-0.001	<u>-5.19</u>
$\delta_{2i}$	-0.13	<u>-2.90</u>	0.46	<u>16.13</u>	-0.003	<u>-1.22</u>	-0.004	<u>-6.84</u>
$\delta_{3i}$	1.47	<u>2.79</u>	-0.17	<u>-1.42</u>	-0.25	<u>-4.42</u>	-0.001	<u>-0.59</u>
$\delta_{4i}$	11.57	<u>3.20</u>	8.82	<u>6.48</u>	0.13	<u>1.01</u>	-0.39	<u>-13.0</u>
$a_{1i}$	0.77	<u>24.4</u>	0.15	<u>1.92</u>	-0.56	<u>-0.53</u>	-10.3	<u>-3.1</u>
$a_{2i}$	0.08	<u>7.64</u>	0.004	<u>0.03</u>	0.29	<u>1.70</u>	0.75	<u>0.31</u>
$a_{3i}$	0.002	<u>1.03</u>	-0.004	<u>-1.81</u>	-0.93	<u>-34.6</u>	-0.31	<u>-1.37</u>
$a_{4i}$	0.0004	<u>2.77</u>	0.007	<u>12.54</u>	0.005	<u>1.4</u>	0.80	<u>117.9</u>
$b_{1i}$	0.65	<u>9.34</u>	-0.15	<u>-1.99</u>	-1.5	<u>-2.44</u>	8.78	<u>2.92</u>
$b_{2i}$	-0.03	<u>-2.9</u>	-0.09	<u>-2.67</u>	0.38	<u>1.97</u>	-1.64	<u>-0.84</u>
$b_{3i}$	-0.001	<u>-1.0</u>	0.002	<u>0.97</u>	0.42	<u>3.71</u>	0.62	<u>3.2</u>
$b_{4i}$	-0.001	<u>-4.39</u>	-0.006	<u>-3.9</u>	-0.006	<u>-0.2</u>	-0.05	<u>-0.91</u>
$LBQ(10)$	53.8	(0.00)	29.4	(0.00)	13.1	(0.21)	126.2	(0.00)
$LBQs(10)$	0.72	(0.99)	29.0	(0.00)	1.62	(0.99)	26.6	(0.00)
$LLR$	-7860							

Notes:  $LBQ(10)$  and  $LBQs(10)$  are the Ljung-Box Q-statistics for standardized and squared standardized residuals at lag 10 respectively and  $LLR$  is log likelihood ratio. Values underlined are t-values and those in brackets are the probabilities for the Ljung-Box Q-statistics.

Table 2: Estimated coefficients for the multivariate GARCH model for Trinidad and Tobago

	<i>Exchange Rate (i=1)</i>		<i>Intervention (i=2)</i>		<i>Interest Rate (i=3)</i>		<i>Volume (i=4)</i>	
$\delta_{1i}$	-0.38	<u>-19.5</u>	0.001	<u>2.53</u>	0.002	<u>0.82</u>	-0.0005	<u>-0.57</u>
$\delta_{2i}$	0.06	<u>0.11</u>	0.01	<u>0.65</u>	-0.05	<u>-1.33</u>	-0.003	<u>-1.46</u>
$\delta_{3i}$	-0.11	<u>-0.53</u>	0.01	<u>2.25</u>	-0.12	<u>-3.56</u>	0.001	<u>1.02</u>
$\delta_{4i}$	3.25	<u>0.84</u>	0.09	<u>1.05</u>	0.33	<u>0.84</u>	-0.41	<u>-21.9</u>
$a_{1i}$	-1.09	<u>-109.1</u>	-0.59	<u>-1.67</u>	-0.47	<u>-0.75</u>	-98.7	<u>-10.9</u>
$a_{2i}$	0.001	<u>5.7</u>	-0.98	<u>-238.1</u>	0.02	<u>1.36</u>	1.18	<u>5.9</u>
$a_{3i}$	-0.003	<u>-0.81</u>	-0.06	<u>-1.53</u>	0.99	<u>160.5</u>	-0.05	<u>-0.09</u>
$a_{4i}$	0.002	<u>13.4</u>	0.006	<u>1.38</u>	0.002	<u>0.81</u>	0.71	<u>6.53</u>
$b_{1i}$	0.11	<u>6.25</u>	-1.85	<u>-2.62</u>	-0.27	<u>-0.77</u>	-34.9	<u>-3.1</u>
$b_{2i}$	0.001	<u>1.59</u>	0.18	<u>4.48</u>	-0.007	<u>-1.04</u>	0.14	<u>0.43</u>
$b_{3i}$	-0.001	<u>-0.76</u>	0.01	<u>0.88</u>	0.13	<u>4.23</u>	-0.59	<u>-0.61</u>
$b_{4i}$	0.0002	<u>2.96</u>	0.003	<u>1.7</u>	0.002	<u>0.80</u>	0.37	<u>11.5</u>
$LBQ(10)$	219.5	0.00	78.5	0.00	36.2	0.00	274.4	0.00
$LBQs(10)$	18.3	0.05	13.7	0.19	4.4	0.93	38.0	0.00
$LLR$	-24862							

Notes: Same as Table 2.

# PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

- **Central bank intervention tended to move the exchange rate in the desired direction in both Jamaica and T&T**
- **The BOJ tended to lean against the wind while the CBTT did not, implying CBTT not targeting the trend rate**
- **The relationship between intervention and interest rates is best characterized by the signaling framework in Jamaica**
- **The implementation of DI caused increased xrate volatility in the short term in Jamaica but not T&T**
- **Less volatility in Jamaica when policy interest rate used compared to DI**
- **Spillovers from xrate to trading volume in Jamaica suggest the microstructure and MDH a factor in the market – not a factor in T&T**
- **Differences generated by the market structure where the Jamaican market is more constrained by opportunity cost on the interest rate side because of the structure of SS and DD**

**END**

**THANK YOU**



Dave.Seerattan@sta.uwi.edu  
www.ccmfuwi.org

