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Abstract

The equation of exchange is not in itself a theory of the demand for money. It can be argued that it is no more than an identity which determines the value of velocity. Given certain assumptions it can be a theory of the aggregate price level. One such supposition is that velocity is a constant, or at least a stable function of a few variables. Velocity over time is far from being a constant. Friedman argues that this is mainly due to errors of measurement and deviations between actual and desired velocity. Keynes suggests that there is no reason to believe that velocity is stable, and that in periods of underemployment equilibrium it may be quite volatile. He also proposes that velocity will depend on the structure of the economy, including the state of technology and institutional arrangements. The main aim of this thesis is to employ long time series data and up to date econometric techniques to produce evidence that relate to these two opposing views. The models employed use both income and transactions velocity measures.

Transactions velocity has been much neglected in the twentieth century, on the grounds that a direct statistical measure is not available. This thesis attempts to resolve this problem by using archive material, sixty variables and seven thousand observations to construct an original transactions series for the period 1870-1991.
The thesis traces the historical origins of the concept of velocity, provides a comprehensive and critical review of earlier work on the subject and produces a considerable amount of empirical work based on long term United Kingdom series of observations. The reported evidence using Johansen cointegration techniques, suggests that there is a long run vector between velocity and a few economic variables. However, the dynamic relationships are both unstable and volatile over the full sample period. Only in using sub-samples can satisfactory statistical results be achieved.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

There is a long history to the equation of exchange. In its most famous form, following Newcombe (1885), and popularised by Fisher (1911), it is written as:

$$MV = PT$$

where $M$ is the quantity of money, $V$ is transactions velocity of circulation, $P$ is the price level and $T$ the volume of transactions. This equation is not in itself a theory of the demand for money. It is no more than an identity which determines the value of velocity. However, if one assumes that $M$ is exogenous, $V$ is a constant, or a stable function of a few variables and $T$ is determined by the full employment output of the economy, then it becomes a theory of the price level.

Even a cursory look at empirical velocity data denies constancy. Friedman and Schwartz (1982) argue that this is due to errors of measurement and deviations between actual and desired velocity. Keynes suggests that there is no reason to suggest that velocity is a constant, and in periods of underemployment equilibrium it may be volatile. He further argues that velocity will depend on the structure of banking and industry, social habits, the distribution of income, and the effective cost of holding idle balances. Only if none of these factors are changing, can velocity be thought of as being constant. It is these two opposing hypotheses that will be the main theme of the thesis.
The fact that measured velocity appears to be volatile raises a number of questions regarding the operation of the equation of exchange and the effective conduct of monetary policy. In particular there is Keynes's liquidity trap, a case where the volatility of the velocity of circulation of money may frustrate the goals of monetary policy. Indeed, Keynes argued that velocity is very unstable, and will, for the most part, adapt to whatever changes independently occur in nominal income or the stock of money. Furthermore, if monetary policy is to be operated correctly, it is necessary for the monetary authorities to ascertain whether a shift in velocity is temporary or permanent. What emerges is the importance of forecasting future velocity movements. One approach to this problem is the construction of an econometric causal model to explain past movements and forecast future values of velocity. This is the approach adopted in this thesis. In undertaking this task, an attempt has been made to answer the fundamental question of whether velocity is a stable function of just a few variables or unstable, continuously adapting to structural developments taking place in the economy.

The layout of the thesis is as follows: Chapter two reviews the origins of the concept of velocity in the context of the quantity theory of money. Chapter three conducts a critical and extensive survey of empirical work and ascertains the causal factors that influence velocity behaviour. Chapter four criticises the methodology of earlier empirical literature, considers the development of cointegration analysis, and develops an estimation
strategy to test the hypotheses. Chapter five is concerned with the definition, measurement, behaviour, and properties of velocity itself, as well as consideration of divisia monetary indices. Chapter six looks in more detail at the construction of a transactions variable for the United Kingdom, the data of which is used to construct a transactions velocity variable. Chapter seven builds a theoretical long term model, and proceeds to test it using Johansen cointegration estimation techniques. Chapter eight constructs a theoretical short run dynamic model. Chapter nine tests the model constructed in chapter eight, and brings together the long and short term models, and compares them with earlier empirical work. The final chapter provides a summary of and reports on the overall conclusions.
Chapter 2
The origins of the concept of velocity in the context of the quantity theory of money

2.1 Introduction

A simple definition of the velocity of circulation is the number of times a unit of money is transferred between economic agents in a given period of time. The evolution of transactions between individuals in the civilised world can be divided into four stages. First, we have simple barter, where any commodity is exchanged against any other. Second, trade with a recognized medium, fish, oxen, or utensils. Third the use of ingots made of precious metal, stamped with a mark guaranteeing weight. The first use of this can be traced to the Lydians, Greek inhabitants of modern western Turkey in the late seventh century before Christ. Fourth, the replacement of all coins of precious metal by token or symbolic money. In particular the use of paper notes, cheques, credit cards, and electronic transfers.

While much is made by economic historians of the role of the velocity of circulation in the rapid price inflation of the sixteenth century, following the inflow of precious metals from the New World, [see Rich and Wilson, 1967, pp.442-450], the concept of velocity did not emerge until the mid seventeenth century. It is William Petty (1664) with his book "Verbum Sapienti" that marks the origins of modern analysis of the velocity of circulation. He poses the important question of whether there is enough money in circulation for the needs of
trade. It is discernible from early work that there was a divergence of the economic literature into two schools of thought. On the one hand are the "motion" theorists who consider the purely mechanical notion of velocity of circulation. On the other, the "cash balance" theorists, who consider money at rest and who argue that the size of the cash balances held is not dependent on the properties of coins but on individuals' actions governed by economic motives. These motives lead to the velocity of circulation being inversely proportional to the demand for money balances. In modern economic literature on velocity the views of the "cash balance" theorists have become dominant while the ideas put forward by the motion theorists have been conveniently neglected. It is, however, appropriate here that we should begin with further consideration of both schools.

2.2 Motion Theory

Motion theory is concerned with the circular course that coins have to follow in the pursuit of trade. This idea suggests a purely mechanical notion of velocity. That is the time and distance between transactions of a given coinage. According to Petty (1664), the larger the number of transactions in a given time, and the closer together, from a geographical perspective, that they take place, the greater is the velocity of circulation and the smaller the amount of money needed in circulation. It must be remembered, that the monetary system was not fully developed at this stage. As Cantillon (1732) points out, in country areas, money was only needed to pay the landlords' rent, and for transactions concerning commodities which must of
necessity be purchased in a town. Cantillon is the first to recognize the significance of banks in stimulating the velocity of circulation. When a landlord in London receives his rent, he proceeds to deposit it with a banker, who subsequently lends it as money so that it continues in circulation. This, and the issue of notes by banks, he views not as an augmentation of the money supply but as the acceleration of its velocity of circulation.

To the "motion" theorists the velocity of circulation is a property of money, a kind of energy which results from coins being exchanged hand to hand. Money is seen as a durable material in contrast to other goods which are continually deteriorating to be replaced by others. In periods in which only metallic currency exists this view does not lead to any difficulties. However, with the advent of non-durable means of circulation this view is less straightforward.

Cantillon's paper "Essai sur la nature du commerce en general" contributes three further points of importance: first, an increase in the quantity of money increases consumption and prices throughout a country. Second, an acceleration in the speed of the velocity of circulation increases economic activity to a certain extent. Third, an excess of money in the economy leads to price inflation, and in order to control rising prices it is necessary for the state to withdraw money and constrain the rate of velocity of circulation.
In his critique of "motion theory" Cantillon developed a good understanding of the relationship between the stock of money and the circular flow of income and he is among the first economists to have contributed to our understanding of the equation of exchange. He defined explicitly the concept of velocity of circulation, viewing it not as a constant but as a variable influenced by both technological and economic variables.

2.3 Cash Balance Theory

The cash balance theorists consider money when it is at rest, in the hands of the landlord, the tenant, and the banker. They argue that the size of cash balances held is not dependent on the properties of coins but on the need for money at a given time. In consequence the velocity of circulation is inversely proportional to the demand for money balances. Early cash balance theory is epitomised by Locke's essay entitled "Some considerations of the consequences of lowering the Interest and raising the Value of Money". Locke (1623) considers that a certain amount of money is required for a country to carry out its transactions, although the value of this money stock is difficult to ascertain:

"... what proportion that is, is hard to determine, because it depends not barely on the quantity of money, but the quickness of its circulation."

(Locke (1623) p.23)
He is not interested in the physical exchange of coins, but the need of an individual for a cash balance:

"Every man must have at least so much money, or so timely recruits, as may in hand, or in short distance of time, satisfy his creditor who supplies him with the necessaries of life, or his trade."

(Locke (1623) p.23)

Locke explicitly points out that it is important to consider average cash balances over a period in time, rather than balances at a particular moment:

" ....... we are not to consider here how much money is in any one man's, or in any one sort of man's hands, at one time; .... but how much money is necessary to be in each man's hands all the year round taking one time with another .......

(Locke (1623) p.26)

He also argues that average cash balances will vary for different types of people, labourers, landlords, tenants, and brokers. The volume of such cash balances is determined by the way in which receipts and disbursements are linked together.

Locke is also among the first to recognise the influence of interest rates on the value of money:
"... so far the change of interest, as all other things that promote or hinder trade, may alter the value of money, in reference to commodities."

(Locke (1623) p.32)

In mentioning velocity he explicitly looks upon it as a phenomenon which may promote or hinder trade:

"... that it were better for trade ... for more money would be stirring, and less would do the business, if rents were paid by shorter intervals than six months"

(Locke (1623) p.27)

Locke also notes:

"... that the multiplying of brokers hinders the trade of any country, by making the circuit, which the money goes, larger, and in that circuit more stops ..."

(Locke (1623) p.28)

In defining money the cash balance theorists regard both durable and non-durable currency as acceptable. Consequently, this theory is especially adaptable to the concept of credit money. Locke had a clear view of a naive quantity theory where he assumed both the velocity of circulation and the number of transactions as constants. Hume (1752) followed Locke but made a clear distinction between long-run statics and short-run dynamics. In the long run the price level would be proportional to the money stock, but in the short run, or transition period, changes in the money supply would produce changes in the number of transactions. It is at this juncture that the beginnings of the influence of
the business cycle upon the behaviour of velocity of circulation can be seen. Thornton (1802) in his book "An Enquiry into the Nature and Effects of Paper Credit of Great Britain" considers the cause of the differences in the velocity of circulation of the same kinds of money at different times. Thornton like Locke believed that the velocity of circulation is determined by the inclination of merchants to hold money in cash. Nevertheless the propensity to do so will be affected by general levels of confidence:

"When ... a season of distrust arises, prudence suggests, that the loss of interest arising from a detention of notes for a few additional days should not be regarded."

(Thornton (1802) p.48)

He further suggests that in times of uncertainty guineas are hoarded, and even private individuals keep money in times of distrust, and this leads to a slower velocity of circulation. Thornton, a century before Keynes's idea of the speculative demand for money, perceives the damage caused to the economy by these fluctuations in velocity and uses this as an argument for the use of paper money as against gold:

"In a commercial country, subjected to that moderate degree of occasional alarm and danger which we have experienced, gold is by no means that kind of circulating medium which is the most desirable ... It is apt to circulate with very different degrees of rapidity, and also to be suddenly withdrawn, in consequence of its being an article intrinsically valuable, and capable of
The importance of Thornton's contribution is that he perceives the fluctuations in the velocity of circulation which occur in the alternating periods of confidence and distrust. Thus he introduces the significance of the velocity of circulation for the problem of the business cycle. It is from this foundation that he states the first clear formulation of the modern quantity theory:

"It is on the degree of the rapidity of circulation of each (money and goods), combined with the consideration of quantity, and not on the quantity alone, that the value of the circulating medium of any country depends."

(Thornton (1802) p.307)

Tooke (1838) extends Thornton's statement by pointing out the contrast between times of speculation and times of dullness:

"The same sum, circulating in times of confidence and speculation with rapidity from hand to hand, will perform a great many more exchanges, and act upon prices with much greater effect than a larger sum in periods of dullness and absence of grounds for speculation; or at times when alarm and that of confidence induce the bankers and possessors generally of monied capitals to increase their reserves and withhold their usual balances"

(Tooke (1838) p.156)

Tooke, thereby, explicitly states the connection between the modern business cycle and changes in velocity of circulation.
2.4 Early Algebraic Versions of the Equation of Exchange

So far in this chapter we have considered the historical roots of the velocity of circulation of money. However, in order to proceed with our analysis in this thesis it is useful to state these arguments in algebraic form. Algebraic versions of the equation of exchange can be traced back to the seventeenth century - a comprehensive history of their development can be found in Margot (1942) and Humphrey (1984). A rudimentary version of the equation of exchange was given by Briscoe (1694) and Lloyd (1771), although, unfortunately, they omitted any discussion of the term velocity of exchange. One of the first comprehensive statements of the equation of exchange was by Lubbock (1840), who included all the terms in the equation and preceded Fisher in distinguishing between the quantities and velocities of hard currency, bank notes and bills of exchange. The nineteenth century saw a proliferation of papers throughout Europe on the algebraic components of the equation of exchange: in Germany, Lang (1811), Rau (1841), in Italy Pantaleoni (1889), in France Levasseur (1858), Walras (1874), de Foville (1907), and in America, Newcomb (1885), Hadley (1896), Norton (1902), and Kemmerer (1907). Of this group Newcomb perhaps gives the clearest statement. He started with consideration of the concept of exchange as
involving the transfer of money for wealth. By adding all exchanges that take place in the economy he arrived at what he called his "equation of societary circulation", that is:

$$VR = KP$$

(2.1)

where $V$ is the total value of currency, $R$ is the rapidity (velocity) of circulation, $K$ is the volume of transactions, and $P$ is a price index. While Fisher is usually given credit for the equation of exchange, Newcomb actually preceded him by over twenty five years. However Fisher (1909) acknowledged this to some extent when writing Newcomb's obituary, where he stated that his most important contribution to economics was:

"the distinction he applied in particular to what he called "societary circulation", or the equation of exchange between money and goods. So far as I am aware, he was the first definitely to enunciate this equation, expressing the fact that the quantity of money multiplied by its velocity of circulation is equal to the price level multiplied by the volume of business transactions. This equation with due amplification, represents the so called "quantity theory of money" in its highest form."

(Fisher (1909) p.642)

2.5 Irving Fisher's Contribution

While Newcomb can be credited with the formulation of the transactions form of the quantity equation, it is Fisher (1911) in his book "The Purchasing Power of Money" who popularized it. Fisher followed the "motion theory" tradition, suggesting that velocity is determined primarily by technological and
institutional factors. Following Newcomb he defined the equation of exchange as:

"a statement, in mathematical form, of total transactions effected in a certain period in a given community ... In the grand total of all exchanges for a year, the total money paid is equal to the total value of goods bought. This equation thus has a money side and a goods side. The money side is the total money paid, and may be considered as the product of the quantity of money multiplied by its rapidity of circulation. The goods side is made up of the products of quantities of goods exchanged multiplied by their respective prices."

(Fisher (1911) pp.15-17)

In formulating the algebraic equation of exchange Fisher derived two forms: the first, where the left hand side concerning monetary transactions is aggregated, and the second, where payments are divided into: (i) those effected by the transfer of hand to hand currency, including coin, and (ii) those effected by the transfer of deposits. Therefore we have:

$$MV + M'V' = PT$$ \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

where M is the currency in circulation, V is the transactions velocity of circulation, P is the general price level, T an index of the volume of trade, M' is bank deposits, V' is bank deposits velocity. The equation of exchange represents the transfer of goods, services and securities from one economic agent to
another, and where the initial agent receives a transfer of money in return. The right hand side of the equation represents the transfer of goods, services, or securities. This is a continuous process, a physical flow of goods, services and securities which once transferred, disappear from economic circulation. The left hand side of the equation is the matching transfer of money. This money once transferred, is treated as retaining its identity and accounted for, regardless of whether it is used or not during the accounting period. Thus, money is treated as a stock, not a flow.

Fisher realised that the equation of exchange was an identity. But he proceeded to suggest that variations in M and M' produce no changes in T. He did not claim a constancy of V and V', but rather that they are independent of M and M', and by implication of P or T. Similarly T is assumed to be independent of M, M', V, V' and P. Thus, Fisher viewed the components of the equation of exchange in the following way:

"The volume of trade, like the velocity of circulation of money, is independent of the quantity of money. An inflation of the currency cannot increase the product of farms and factories, nor the speed of freight trains or ships. The stream of business depends on natural resources and technical conditions, not on the quantity of money."

(Fisher (1911) p.155)

He also proceeds to state his hypothesis of how the quantity theory of money operates:
"Since then, a doubling in the quantity of money: (1) will normally double deposits subject to check in the same ratio and (2) will not appreciably affect either the velocity of circulation of money or deposits or the volume of trade, it follows necessarily and mathematically that the level of prices must double. While therefore, the equation of exchange, of itself, asserts no causal relation between the quantity of money and price level, any more than it asserts a causal relationship between any other two factors, yet when we take into account conditions known quite apart from that equation, viz, that a change in M produces a proportional change in M', and no changes in V, V', or the Q's [the T's in our terminology] there is no possible escape from the conclusion that a change in the quantity of Money (M) must normally cause a proportional change in the price level (the P's) ... We may now restate then in what causal sense the quantity theory is true. It is true in the sense that one of the normal effects of an increase in the quantity of money is an exact proportional increase in the general level of prices."

(Fisher (1911) pp. 156-7)

Despite the large amount of empirical work carried out by Fisher (1919) and Snyder (1934) the transactions version of the equation of exchange has fallen out of use. The main reason for this seems to have been the problems in measuring the various components in particular transactions. Fisher included in his definition of transactions, purchase or sale of wealth (real estate, commodities), property (bonds, mortgages, private notes, bills of exchange) and services (of rented real estate, of rented
commodities, of hired workers). These various terms aggregated to $\sum P_i Q_i$ where $P_i$ are prices, and $Q_i$ are "quantities". To reduce this sum to a manageable size, Fisher introduced the idea of a general price level, defining a base year price weighted sum of quantities as a single variable called transactions, which gives the following:

$$\sum (P_i Q_i) = P_t T_t$$

where $P_t$ is a price index using current quantities as weights, such that $P_t = \sum (P_i Q_i) / \sum (P_0 Q_0)$ and $T$ is a quantity index of current quantities weighted by base year prices so that $T = \sum P_0 Q_0$. The difficulties in measuring transactions, obtaining a general price level and overcoming the ambiguities arising from the mixture of current and capital transactions have never been satisfactorily resolved. Indeed the more recent comprehensive estimate of transactions was given by Cramer (1981a), who following Keynes (1930) distinguished between goods transactions and financial transactions. He suggests two reasons for treating these as a separate category. First, there is some doubt as to whether these financial transactions constitute demand for money or the placement of idle balances. Second, they constitute a large turnover on what are quite small balances, so that velocity is artificially larger than should be the case. Even with the more commonly quoted income velocity form of the quantity equation, there is still a number of statistical measures which could be thought of as constituting income. Indeed as Friedman and Schwartz (1982) point out, the emphasis on transactions reflected in the Fisher version of the quantity equation, suggests dividing total transactions into categories of payments for which the
payment period or practices differ, for example capital transactions, purchases of final goods and services, purchases of intermediate goods, payments for the use of resources/services, wages and salaries, and other payments.

An excellent review of how neoclassical monetary economics evolved from the classical orthodoxy of the nineteenth century can be found in Laidler (1993). This study considers the theoretical developments in the context of contemporary policy and historical events. Laidler argues that the quantity theory of money played a central role in laying the foundations of modern monetary analysis which emerged after the First World War.

2.6 The Renaissance of the Cash Balance Approach

It is with Pigou that we see the renaissance of the cash balance approach of Locke and Hume. Pigou (1917) and later Marshall (1923) express the equation of exchange as:

\[ \frac{1}{P} = \frac{KR}{M} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

where \( R \) is total resources of the community, \( K \) is the proportion of resources the community chooses to keep in the form of titles to legal tender, \( M \) is the number of units of legal tender, and \( P \) is a price index. To Pigou (1917) the main difference between Fisher and himself was that by focusing:

"attention on the proportion of their resources that people choose to keep in the form of titles to legal tender instead of
focusing on the "velocity of circulation" it brings us into relation with volition - the ultimate cause of demand instead of something that seems at first sight accidental and arbitrary."

(Pigou (1917) p.174)

By the time that Pigou's book, "Industrial Fluctuations" was published in 1927, the empirical difficulties in measuring an index of transactions, and the price index associated with it, together with the development of national income accounting, led to the formulation of the income version of the equation of exchange:

\[ MV = PY \] (2.4)

where \( Y \) represents real national income, \( P \) the implicit price deflator, \( M \) the stock of money, and \( V \) the income velocity of the circulation of money. It is of critical importance to realise that the \( V \) in equation (2.2) and the \( V \) in equation (2.4) are not the same, as transactions velocity includes intermediate goods and the exchange of existing assets, in addition to payment for final goods and services. The transactions velocity will be affected by vertical integration of firms, which will reduce the number of transactions involved in a single income circuit. Furthermore, technological changes that lengthen or shorten the production process from raw materials to final product will also affect the number of transactions undertaken. This will not affect income velocity. The transactions version includes the purchase of an existing asset e.g. land, a house, equity, while the income version disregards these completely. The income approach measures transactions in terms of the value-added by
each sector of the economy.

The development of the income version of the equation of exchange is an important milestone in the theoretical development of the velocity of circulation of money. Transactions velocity is put to one side and the income velocity forms the foundation for the major developments in analysis which were about to take place. It is to these developments which we now turn.

2.7 The Cambridge Cash Balance Approach

The Cambridge Cash Balance approach associated with Pigou (1917), Marshall (1923), and Keynes (1923) considers a new algebraic equation:

\[ M = KPY \] (2.5)

where \( K = 1/V \) and is the time duration of the flow of goods and services money could purchase, that is the fraction of income held in the form of money balances. Arithmetically \( MV=PY \) and \( M=KPY \) are equivalent. However they are based on opposing views of the role of money in the economy. \( MV=PY \) sees money as primarily a medium of exchange, and in line with the "motion" theorists money is continually moving around the economy changing hands. Whereas \( M=KPY \) follows the "cash balance" approach where money is a temporary abode of purchasing power, that is a cash balance at rest. In consequence the Cambridge Cash Balance Approach view of the money stock, differs from the "motion"
theory idea. The "motion" theorists view money as currency and checkable deposits, assets used primarily in the process of exchange. While the Cambridge approach includes, in addition to these, non-checkable deposits and other liquid assets.

Pigou and his contemporaries view the quantity theory based on $M=KPY$ as both a theory of money supply and money demand. The money supply is determined by the monetary and banking authorities, while the money demanded is proportional to nominal income, with $K$ the factor of proportionality, or the desired holding of real cash balances by economic agents. $K$, in addition to those factors outlined by Fisher, is determined by the rate of interest. As Bain (1980) points out, this could have been shown explicitly by writing:

$$M = K(r)PY \quad (2.6)$$

where $r$ is the rate of interest. He further states:

"... the omission of $r$ from the formal equation made it all too easy to argue as if $K$ were a constant." (Bain (1980) p.81)

2.8 Keynes and the Reinterpretation of the Cash Balance Approach

Keynes (1936) in his "General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money", offered an alternative approach to the interpretation of changes in money income and investment, rather than the relationship between money income and the stock of money. Keynes developed the concept of why people hold money. He emphasized the view that the aggregate level of transactions, bears a stable relationship to the level of income. He suggested three motives
for holding money: the "transaction motive", that is the planned regular payments; the "precautionary motive", that is the holding of money for unexpected transactions, a level of liquid funds for times of emergency or uncertainty; and the "speculative motive", that is money holdings for speculation in financial markets in order to obtain monetary or other gain. Having done this, Keynes argued that the quantity of money demanded could be treated as if it were divided into two parts, one part, $M_1$, "held to satisfy the transactions and precautionary motives", the other part, $M_2$, "held to satisfy the speculative motive". Keynes suggested that $M_1$ was roughly a constant fraction of income, and $M_2$ as arising from "uncertainty as to the future course of interest rates."

In terms of defining the velocity of circulation, Keynes was unclear whether it should be seen as the ratio of $Y$ to $M$, or as the ratio of $Y$ to $M_1$. He chose the latter view, and further assumed that transactions and precautionary velocity ($V_1$) while not necessary constant in the long-run, could be thought of as being so in the short term. As Keynes (1936) states:

"There is, of course no reason for supposing $V$ is constant. Its value will depend on the character of banking and industrial organization on social habits, on the distribution of income between different classes and on the effective cost of holding idle cash. Nevertheless, if we have a short period of time in view and can safely assume no material change in any of these factors, we can treat $V$ as nearly enough constant."

(Keynes (1936) p.201)
However, Keynes argued that under conditions of underemployment 
equilibrium the V in equation (2.4) and the K in equation (2.5) 
were in fact very unstable and would for the most part adapt to 
whatever changes independently occurred in money income or the 
stocks of money. In order to understand this phenomenon we need 
to consider the other component of Keynes's definition of money, 
that is M2, held to satisfy speculative motives.

In analysing the speculative demand for money, Keynes 
concentrated on two alternative ways of holding financial assets, 
money and long-term bonds. The nominal value of money is seen as 
fixed, but that of bonds will change when the rate of interest 
is altered. An increase in the market rate of interest will lead 
to a fall in the price of bonds which offer a fixed rate of 
interest. Investors, in deciding whether to hold money or bonds, 
will also take into account possible gains and losses from 
holding bonds as well as the interest income. The important 
factor in the Keynesian theory is not the absolute level of the 
rate of interest (r), but the extent of the divergence from what 
can be considered a relatively safe (expected/"natural") rate of 
interest. Investors' views about the rate of interest are 
distributed about some expected rate of interest (p), which will 
vary between individuals, except at low levels. The larger the 
current rate of interest in relation to the expected level, the 
more investors will expect it to fall and thus choose to hold 
bonds. When the rate of interest is lower than the expected rate 
of interest asset holders in the main will expect interest rates 
to rise and choose to hold money. This relationship showing the
demand for real speculative balances $M_2$ is known as the liquidity preference curve, as shown by figure 2.1.

**Figure 2.1**

where $r$ = the nominal interest rate, $p$ = the expected interest rate, and $(r-p)$ = the differential between nominal interest rate and the expected interest rate. It follows that the speculative demand for money is a declining function of $(r-p)$. Thus;

$$M_2 = f((r-p))$$

where $f'((r-p)) < 0$. Keynes argued that at some low positive rate of interest the elasticity of the liquidity preference curve would become infinite. At this point investors do not believe interest rates will fall any lower and the expectation is for them to rise. Given the small yield, they would not be compensated for the risk of capital loss. Therefore, rather than hold bonds at a lower yield they convert their assets into money.
It is also important to note that Keynesians believe that in a situation of underemployment equilibrium, the demand for money equation will be unstable. Consequently, accurate prediction using the demand for money function may not be possible in these circumstances. A full discussion of the liquidity trap can be found in Johnson (1967, 1972). Nevertheless, there is little evidence to support the liquidity trap hypothesis. One of the most notable studies using both short and long term interest rates and a variety of money definitions was conducted by Laidler (1966). He found that there was no tendency for interest rate elasticities to be higher at low rates of interest.

The importance of this analysis to our understanding of the equation of exchange is that it is possible for there to be offsetting movements in velocity which directly cancel out any monetary policy undertaken. To understand the liquidity trap in the context of velocity behaviour, it is necessary to use the IS/IM framework. On the whole Keynesians see monetary policy as unimportant compared with the role played by fiscal policy. This suggests that the IS curve is steep and the IM curve flat. By considering two extreme cases of either a horizontal IM curve or a vertical IS curve, it can be seen that any change in the rate of growth of money is completely offset by an opposite change in velocity, so that monetary policy has no effect at all.

In the first example of the liquidity trap, the IM curve is horizontal, that is the demand for money is perfectly elastic with respect to the rate of interest. In consequence any
additional money is absorbed into idle/speculative balances. In this situation an expansionary monetary policy would be incapable of reducing the rate of interest below $r^*$, and the level of income velocity would fall. This is shown in figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.2](Source: Vane and Thompson (1979))

In the second example, consumption and investment are completely interest inelastic, again monetary changes have no effect on real output. As the stock of money grows, interest falls to maintain equilibrium in the money market, and velocity falls as the demand for money rises relative to the unchanged level of output. In this case the diagrammatic representation shows a vertical IS curve, an initial LM curve, and a second LM curve with the lower interest rate, as shown in figure 2.3.
The liquidity trap hypothesis states that the demand for money becomes perfectly elastic at low levels of interest rates. This further suggests that the relationship between the demand for money and the rate of interest will be unstable over time.

We can now formalise Keynes' analysis algebraically as

\[ M = M_1 + M_2 = k_i y + f(r-p) \]  

(2.8)

where \( M \) = real money balances, \( M_1 \) = real money balances held to satisfy transactions and precautionary motives, \( M_2 \) = real money balances held to satisfy the speculative motive, \( P \) = the price deflator, \( r \) = the current rate of interest, \( p \) = the rate of interest expected to prevail, \( k_i \) = the analogue to the inverse of the velocity of circulation of money, \( y \) = real income. This is
treated as being determined by payment practices and hence is constant in the short run. However, later Keynesians, Baumol (1952) and Tobin (1956) argue that k should be regarded as a function of interest rates.

2.9 Milton Friedman and the Modern Quantity Theory

Friedman (1956) re-examines the quantity theory of money in the light of Keynes' analysis, making the demand for money the explicit starting point. He draws attention away from the motives that prompt people to hold money, and towards the question of how much money individuals want to hold under various circumstances. The demand for money is treated in the same way as the demand for any other financial or physical asset. Thus the demand for any particular asset is determined by the characteristics including yield in relation to that of other assets, the individual's choice being subject to a wealth constraint. The budget constraint determines a maximum amount of goods or assets which can be held at any given time. Wealth can be considered to be the sum of an individual's assets, durable goods, bonds etc. However, if there is no restriction on what can be bought or sold there will be in fact no maximum limit on the amount of money an individual can hold. For if he has labour income there is no reason why he cannot trade his labour for money as well. With this kind of framework bonds can be considered a claim on future interest payments, and stocks a claim on future income from capital equipment. Therefore, it is difficult to distinguish between trade in these assets and trade in future income. This wealth can be split into two distinct elements, human wealth, and
non-human wealth. The distinction between the two is that capital or non-human wealth is tangible, while human wealth is intangible. Human wealth is also assumed to be less liquid than non-human wealth.

Friedman also argues that the rate of return on holding money is not a constant. If the price level rises, the real value of money holdings falls and vice versa. The expected rate of growth of price inflation can thus be interpreted as an expected rate of return on money holdings, and other things being equal, the higher the expected rate of return on money balances the more will be held. Thus, the expected rate of change of price inflation becomes an important variable in the demand for money function. The price level, too, has to be mentioned, as money is held for the service it provides to its owners, that is the source of purchasing power.

Thus Friedman’s model of the demand for money can be written as;

\[ M_d = f \left[ W, r \cdot \frac{1}{P}, \frac{1}{P} \frac{dP}{dt}, h \right] P \]  

(2.9)

where \( M_d \) = the demand for money in nominal terms, \( W \) = wealth, \( r \) = the rate of interest, \( P \) = the price level, \( h \) = the ratio of human to non-human wealth. In the period since the "Restatement" many refinements have taken place. In particular the problems of measuring wealth have been by-passed by the introduction of permanent income (see Friedman (1957)). This is the maximum amount of income that the individual could spend on consumption each year, without accumulating debts for the next generation.
Klein (1974a and 1974b) suggests that studies in the demand for money that ignore the own rate of return on money, for instance seven day deposit accounts, underestimate the sensitivity of the demand for money to the opportunity cost of holding it. When market interest rates rise, so does the own rate of return on money. In consequence the interest differential between money and alternative assets alters less than the value of market interest rates. Thus Friedman's (1970) demand for money function can be written as:

\[ M_0/P = f(y_p; r_m; r_b; r_e; 1/P \cdot dP/dt; u) \]  
(2.10)

where \( M_0/P \) = the demand for real money balances, \( y_p \) = permanent income, \( r_m \) = the rate of return on money, \( r_b \) = the rate of return on bonds, \( r_e \) = the rate of return on equities, \( u \) = individual preferences, \( a \) = budget constraint, \( b \) = the return on money and competing assets, \( c \) = individual preferences. As the income velocity of circulation is simply the reciprocal of the number of weeks of income held as money, we can see why an analysis of velocity is equivalent to an analysis of the demand for money, and how the arguments outlined above are of use to the aims of this thesis.

To Friedman the concept of velocity can be explained in two ways. The simplest of these is that measured velocity is the ratio of two independent magnitudes, income and money, each determined by a separate set of forces. This explanation is consistent with the view that: (1) there does not exist a stable demand for money
function containing a small number of variables; (2) there exists a stable function, but it has a special form so that velocity adapts passively to the separate movements in income and money; (3) the errors of measurement of numerator and denominator dominate the fluctuations of velocity. The other explanation is that velocity is a numerical constant, if averaged over individual cycles. According to this view deviations from constancy reflect either errors of observation or temporary differences between actual and desired velocity. However, Friedman and Schwartz (1982) accept that measured velocity is not a constant:

"Velocity, as measured, is clearly not a numerical constant. However, measured velocity differs from true "permanent" or desired velocity for two reasons: errors of measurement, and deviations between actual and desired velocity. May these deviations not explain the failure of measured velocity to be a numerical constant"

(Friedman and Schwartz (1982) p.208)

Nevertheless, while velocity is not a constant, Friedman and Schwartz (1982) suggest that one should not forget how far the idea of constancy explains variations in the data.

"Though a numerically constant velocity must be rejected as a full explanation of the relationship between money and income, it should not be dismissed without recording how far it takes us. For any lengthy period ... the simplest and most rigid form of the constant - velocity view - accounts for the great bulk in the
variation in nominal income."

(Friedman and Schwartz (1982) p.210)

This statement, is an issue which will have to be examined once again later in the thesis, in the context of the empirical work.

2.10 Conclusion

The origins of modern analysis of the velocity of circulation can be traced to Petty (1664). The early economic literature can be divided into two schools of thought, the "motion" theorists, and the "cash balance" theorists. In modern economic literature the latter have become dominant. While Fisher (1911) is usually given credit for the equation of exchange, Newcomb (1885) actually preceded him by over two decades. The cash balance approach associated with Pigou (1917) laid the foundations for work by Keynes (1936), who developed the concept of why people hold money. He emphasizes the view that the aggregate level of transactions, bears a stable relationship to the level of income. Keynes also argues that velocity can be highly unstable and volatile. It will depend on economic and social structure, and speculative behaviour. Friedman (1956) moves away from the motives that prompt people to hold money towards the question of how much money individuals want to hold under different circumstances. The demand for money is treated like any other good or service, being determined by the characteristics of its yield in relation to other assets. Friedman believes that velocity is a stable function of just a small number of variables, and that measured velocity is volatile due to errors of measurement and deviations between actual and desired
velocity.

This chapter has reviewed the origins of the concept of velocity in the context of the quantity theory of money. In so doing, the roots of many of the controversies which will have to be dealt with in this thesis have been identified. Our first task, in attempting to resolve these issues, is to conduct a critical survey of empirical work, to ascertain the evidence on the causal factors that influence velocity behaviour.
Chapter 3

A Critical Survey of Empirical Work

3.1 Early Work - Cash Balances, Liquidity Preferences, and the Interest Rate

Early empirical work on the velocity of circulation on the whole followed Keynes's views, rejected the idea that the velocity ratio was sufficiently stable in the short run to predict the level of income, and based analysis on the components of aggregate expenditure. Like Keynes, in order to predict the demand for money, researchers sought motives for holding money. One part of the demand for money was assumed to be a constant ratio of transaction balances to income, that is a constant transactions velocity, the remaining monetary demand being functionally dependent on interest rates. The Keynesian function being written as:

\[ M = L(r, Y) \quad L_t < 0 < L_T \]  (3.1)

where \( M \) = real money balances, \( r \) = a rate of interest, \( Y \) = real income, \( L_t \) and \( L_T \) are the derivatives of the \( L \) function with respect to the two arguments. Keynes did not specify a unique set of measurement procedures for the variables or properties of equation (3.1). However, given the assumptions made above, the demand function can be written as:

\[ M = M^T + L = kY + L(r) \]  (3.2)

where \( M^T \) = demand for real transactions balances (active balances), \( L \) = demand for real speculative balances (idle balances), \( k \) = the inverse of transactions velocity. Tobin (1947) provided some empirical support for this hypothesis. He assumed
that the average cash balance $k$ could be computed from time series data by choosing the minimum ratio of $M/Y$, 1929 from his data, the year in which velocity reached a maximum, and he assumed that there were no "speculative" balances in that year. Tobin's specification of the Keynesian hypothesis is generally written as:

$$L = M - \min (M/Y)Y = L(r) \quad (3.3)$$

Following Eisner (1963), who allows a constant minimum component of idle balances, even in years of maximum velocity, Brunner and Meltzer (1963) add a constant term to the Tobin specification of the Keynesian model. Thus they obtain two alternative Keynesian type hypothesis:

$$\ln(L+1) = b_1 \ln r + a_1 + u_1 \quad (3.4)$$

$$L+1 = b_2 + a_2 + u_2 \quad (3.5)$$

Brunner and Meltzer (1963) proceed to estimate equations (3.4) and (3.5) using annual U.S. data for the period 1910-1940 and 1951-1958. The predictions from the two hypotheses are extremely poor for the period as a whole and for each of the sub-periods, although the use of levels and a 1918 base improves the predictive performance somewhat.

These early empirical results depend on quite strict assumptions about the nature of the demand for money function. However, Khusro (1952) who updated Brown's (1939) work on Great Britain, suggested that the ratio of idle balances to liquid assets varies with the rate of interest, and that this ratio is the first indication, albeit very narrowly defined, that a wealth variable plays a role in the demand for money function. Khusro also used
econometric techniques to estimate the value of \( k \), the ratio of active balances to income, improving upon the method outlined above, and found that this enhanced the explanatory performance of the model, which showed a significant inverse relationship between idle money balances and the interest rate.

Other early post-war writers sought to isolate a stable velocity function dependent on interest rates and/or other variables, for example income (see Lathane, 1954, 1960). Lathane avoided the Tobin assumption that the general hypothesis (equation 3.1) could be tested by means of the equation:

\[
L = L(r)
\]  

(3.6)

Instead he presents a variety of additional forms of the Keynesian money demand function. The importance of Lathane's work is that he establishes a linear relationship between income velocity \( (Y/M) \) and the long term rate of interest \( (r_L) \) as measured by corporate bond yields, that is:

\[
\ln V = a + b \ln r_L + u
\]  

(3.7)

Using annual U.S. data for the period 1909 to 1958 he obtains the estimated equation:

\[
\ln V = -0.5 + 1.3 \ln r_L
\]  

(3.8)

Lathane suggests that the theoretical foundation for the relationship between \( V \) and \( r_L \) is that in many instances, bonds are excellent substitutes for money. Money is held mainly to carry out transactions. Its yield is the convenience and utility of holding cash balances. The yield from bonds is balanced at the margin with the yield from money. When interest rates are high, individuals economise on their cash balances. If bonds are a good
substitute for money, while other assets are fairly poor substitutes, then a change in the money supply will tend to affect the bond market rather than expenditure on other assets. In these circumstances, the interest elasticity of demand for cash balances has considerable influence on the effectiveness of monetary policy. Ritter (1959) suggests that when interest rates are low and idle balances large, a small rise in rates is likely to result in a large transfer of funds from hoards to active circulation, thus increasing velocity substantially. However, as interest rates continue to rise, due to continued monetary restraint and persistent demand for funds, idle balances are likely to become exhausted. Correspondingly velocity is likely to encounter an upper limit. As it becomes more difficult to obtain the release of additional funds from the depleted idle balances, velocity will be subject to new constraints, economic activity will become increasingly sensitive to monetary policy and further expansion of GDP will be inhibited.

Meltzer (1963) is critical of both Lathane and Ritter. He reexamines Lathane's work and finds that the interest elasticity does not differ significantly from zero in the period 1900-1929. According to Meltzer, Lathane's result is spurious since it combines the significant results of the later period, with the non-significant results of the first two or three decades. Meltzer argues that the definition of M is important, and that a rise in interest rates will change the demand for money much more when time deposits are excluded from M than when they are included in it. He also finds that measures of income velocity
that include a large proportion of money substitutes in the denominator are less sensitive to interest rate changes than those based on currency and demand deposits alone. Rather than the velocity function Meltzer uses its inverse, that is money per unit of income. Using U.S. data for the period 1900-1958 he obtained the following results:

\[
\ln \frac{1}{V_1} = 2.21 - 1.78 \ln r + 0.02 \ln \frac{W}{P} + \omega_1 \tag{3.9}
\]
\[
\text{(30.4)} \quad \text{(0.61)}
\]
\[R^2 = 0.98\]

\[
\ln \frac{1}{V_2} = 1.37 - 1.34 \ln r + 0.23 \ln \frac{W}{P} + \omega_2 \tag{3.10}
\]
\[
\text{(19.5)} \quad \text{(6.4)}
\]
\[R^2 = 0.96\]

\[\text{(t-statistics in parentheses)}\]

where \(V_1\) = velocity (excluding time deposits), \(V_2\) = velocity (including time deposits), \(r\) = an interest rate, \(W/P\) = wealth divided by prices. Note that \(V_1\) depends only on the interest rate, the parameter on \((W/P)\) not being significantly different from zero, while \(V_2\) depends both on interest rates and wealth as the hypothesis suggests wealth in this context is a budget constraint on the total amount of assets which can be held.

According to Meltzer, Ritter's notion that there is an upper bound to velocity is denied by the data. Interest rates range from 2.35% to 5.31% and there is little evidence of a velocity ceiling. He suggests that if such a ceiling exists, it should take the form of large positive value for \(\omega_1\) in equation (3.9), during periods of high interest rates, that is the measured value
of $1/V_t$ should exceed the predicted value by a large amount. However, this is not borne out by the findings.

The liquidity trap hypothesis is closely related to the proposition that the relationship between the demand for money and the rate of interest can be expected to be unstable over time. In order to assess this hypothesis, Meltzer employs two tests, (1) comparison of the estimates for sub periods - cycles or decades, with those for the entire period, (2) comparison of related cross section studies. The results he obtained for the first of these tests are shown in Table 3.1.

### Table 3.1

Elasticity of $V_t$ with respect to Interest Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Interest Elasticity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900-1958</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1909</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1919</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1958</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Meltzer (1963)
These results suggest that income elasticity is fairly constant over time. This is supported by later evidence by Laidler (1971) for the United Kingdom over the period 1900-1964, which shows little variation between sub periods, and Friedman and Schwartz (1982) who for both the United States and United Kingdom over the period 1867-1975 and various sub periods, found very little variation in interest elasticities.

3.2 Milton Friedman & the Permanent Income Hypothesis

The drawback to all the empirical work outlined above, is that the authors assume that the demand for money is proportional to the level of income. This hypothesis would be challenged by those who regard wealth as a more appropriate variable to include in the velocity function. To Friedman (1959), expectations play an important role in the demand for money, for example expected capital gains, expected income yield, expected price inflation. He concludes from his empirical work that the main determinant of demand for money is permanent income, that is an average expected future income. This contradicts the view stated above that wealth is more appropriate than income. However, as Friedman (1959) points out:

"What comes out as income originally entered as wealth ... the "income" relevant to this equation is not income as measured in the national accounts but income conceived of as the net return on a stock of wealth, or wealth measured by the income it yields ... Permanent income can be regarded as a concept closely allied
to wealth and indeed as an index of wealth"  
(Friedman (1959) p.137)

Friedman suggests that permanent income has greater stability than actual measured income because this is a weighted average. Therefore, actual income fluctuates more widely than permanent income. The empirical findings of Friedman and Schwartz (1963) suggest the services given by money balances are a luxury. So demand for money rises proportionately more than the rise in real income. In other words the real income elasticity of the demand for real money holdings is greater than unity. Accordingly, income velocity should be expected to fall as permanent income rises. Empirical evidence supports this view for the period 1870 - 1947. However, in the post Second World War period there has been a rise in velocity. Permanent income has been rising, but so has velocity. Movements in velocity have been the opposite of what the theory would have predicted. It has been suggested that the rise in interest rates, the growth of money substitutes, and inflationary psychology, explain these movements. Indeed Bordo and Jonung (1987) found that permanent income elasticity of velocity was positive, and significantly different from zero at the 95\% significance level for three European countries. These results suggest that permanent income elasticities of the demand for money are considerably less than one. This is in agreement with other empirical work by Goldfeld (1973). It also implies that there are economies of scale in cash management as argued by Baumol (1952) and Tobin (1956). However, Friedman and Schwartz (1982) reject these explanations. They suggest "one possible common root" of the pre and post Second World War periods, that
is the changing patterns of expectations about economic stability. In their view the instability and uncertainties of the period 1929-1942 led to a sharp increase in the demand for money. In the post war period, growing confidence in future economic stability, with high levels of employment and mild recessions, led to a decline in the demand for money.

While Friedman (1959) believes that interest rates have a systematic effect on the velocity function, with empirical evidence supportive of a positive relationship, he believes the effect to be small. As Friedman states, the observed cyclical changes in interest rates:

"seem most unlikely to account for the ... cyclical pattern in velocity"

(Friedman (1959) p.138)

Nevertheless, in later work (Friedman 1966, 1970) he denies that interest rates have no effect. It is simply that income or wealth are more important. However, there has been much criticism of Friedman's Permanent Income Hypothesis. Tobin (1965) asserts that:

"... the annual percentage change in the money supply explains only 31 per cent of the variation in the annual percentage change in money income over the period 1869-1959. So the relationship between the quantity of money and income is not stable, and neither it appears has velocity been a stable function of permanent income"
3.3 Klein and the "Own" Rate of Interest on Money

Klein (1973) attempts to reconcile the differences between Friedman and Schwartz (1963) and Lathane (1954, 1960), concerning the significance of the rate of interest as a determinant of velocity. He attempts to explain these discrepancies by considering the simultaneous movements that occurred over this period in the inverse of the money multiplier, a variable which has been shown to be related to competitive interest payments on money, known more commonly in recent times as the "Own Return on Money". Once the additional variable is introduced, the major problems in the velocity interest rate relationship are eliminated, and the relationship remains intact over a longer time period.

Klein initially derives an estimate of the interest payments that would be made on money balances in a perfectly competitive banking system. The marginal return on money \( r_m \), is defined as a weighted average of marginal interest on currency \( r_c \), and marginal interest on deposits, \( r_d \).

\[
r_m = \frac{C}{M} r_c + \frac{D}{M} r_d
\]

(3.11)

where the money supply equals currency \( C \) plus commercial bank deposits \( D \).

\[
M = C + D
\]

(3.12)

The interest on currency is assumed to be zero \( r_c = 0 \). Interest on bank deposits can be estimated by measuring the marginal cost of producing the deposits, this for the most part, is interest foregone by commercial banks on the non-interest bearing reserves
in their portfolio. The perfectly competitive interest payments on deposits are:

\[ r_0 = r_i (1 - [R/D]) \]  

(3.13) 

where \( r_i \) equals the marginal rate of return on bank loans and investments, (the marginal return on the interest bearing assets in bank portfolios), and \([R/D]\) is the marginal reserve to deposit ratio. If this ratio is also equal to the average reserve to deposit ratio, and if commercial bank deposits are defined to include demand time deposits we obtain:

\[ r_n = r_i (1 - [H/M]) \]  

(3.14) 

where \( H \) is high powered money which equals currency plus total commercial bank reserves held on deposit such that \( H = C + R \). It is expected that \((1 - [H/M])\) is positively related to the demand for real cash balances and is negatively related to movements in velocity. Klein proceeds to test this hypothesis, using annual U.S. data for the period 1880-1970. His first specification follows Lathane's log relationship stated earlier. (equations 3.7 and 3.8):

\[ \ln V = 0.1436 + 0.4206 \ln r_i \]  

(3.15) 

\( R^2 = 0.075 \quad D.W. = 0.058 \quad s.e. = 0.2997 \)

Although the t-statistic would suggest that the coefficient on the long run rate of interest is statistically different from zero, the high autocorrelation, as indicated by the low Durbin Watson statistic, (the correlation between \( \ln V \) and its lagged value is 0.97), suggested that Friedman and Schwartz were correct to reject this equation.
When Klein adds the high-powered to total money ratio to the regression the following results are obtained:

\[ \ln V = -1.2581 + 0.9117 \ln r^* - 2.3071 \ln (1-\frac{H}{M}) \]  
(3.16)

\[ (8.79) \quad (11.27) \]

\[
R^2 = 0.617 \quad D.W. = 0.271 \quad s.e. = 0.1928
\]

With the addition of this variable, both the size, and the significance of the interest rate coefficient are increased, as is the predictive power of this equation. However, the Durbin-Watson statistic still indicates a problem with autocorrelation.

Klein moves on to consider the Permanent Income Hypothesis. It is pointed out that since Friedman (1959) argues that the velocity, the ratio of measured to permanent income and interest rates all move procyclically, the cyclical movement in velocity may be due to the measured rather than permanent income being used in the calculation of velocity, and this is what the interest rate is picking up. Therefore the ratio of measured to permanent income \( \frac{Y}{Y_p} \) is added as an additional variable to determine the purely secular relationship between velocity and interest. Furthermore, in order to eliminate the implicit constraint that the income elasticity of demand for money equals one, Klein, includes a real income variable in the relationship. In addition a short term interest rate is introduced, since both short and long rates may affect the demand for money.
\[ \ln V = 1.8681 - 0.3353 \ln Y_p + 0.2765 \ln r_L + 0.1866 \ln r_s \]
\[ (13.95) \quad (5.48) \quad (11.02) \]
\[ - 1.2020 \ln (1-[H/M]) + 0.7345 \ln(Y/Y_p) \]
\[ (13.11) \quad (10.33) \]
\[ R^2 = 0.959 \quad D.W. = 0.687 \quad s.e. = 0.0633 \]

The parameter on the ratio of measured to permanent income is significantly different from zero. However, this variable was introduced purely because it is argued that the velocity measure contains the incorrect measurement. If this is the case, and the permanent income weights are correct, a coefficient of unity is expected. Klein argues that the fact that this coefficient is 0.7345 is because the measurement of the variable contains upward bias during the postwar period, due to the failure to take account of the positive trend in the price level when calculating the permanent price level. All other coefficients are of the correct sign, and are significantly different from zero. While the predictive performance of the equation would appear good, this is offset by the presence of autocorrelation, which appears to be a failing in all of Klein's equations. Nevertheless, given this evidence, it would appear that Friedman was wrong in maintaining that rates of interest are much less important determinants of measured velocity, than the ratio of measured to permanent income.

The significance of the inverse of the money multiplier variable is that it suggests that money makers must be aware of how a particular change in the money supply is brought about to fully
understand its effects. An increase in the money supply by open market operations will generally have a greater expansionary effect than those brought about by lowering reserve requirements. Changes in reserve requirements offset by open market purchases, that is changes in the composition of money will have non neutral effects. A change in the banks' reserve ratio will affect interest payments on deposits, and consequently will influence both the desired currency to deposit ratio and the demand for real cash balances.

3.4 Transitory Income, Monetary Shocks, and the Business Cycle

While the ratio of measured to permanent income is introduced in Klein's work because of Friedman's view that the dependent variable is measured incorrectly, this variable can also be used to represent a second argument. The above discussion of permanent income suggests that both measured income and measured consumption contain a permanent and a transitory element. The permanent part is the anticipated and planned element of income and consumption, while the transitory elements are the windfall gains and losses of income and unanticipated changes in consumption. The transitory income will have an effect on money demanded and hence velocity. The ratio of measured to permanent income should have a coefficient of one. A positive coefficient less than one would be in line with Friedman's (1957) permanent income hypothesis, suggesting that velocity moves procyclically. During the business cycle transitory income increases the demand for money, as cash balances serve as a buffer stock. (see Carr
and Darby (1981) and Laidler (1984)). However, in the long-run these transitory balances are worked off, returning the coefficient to unity. These observations that can be said to constitute the pointers to a buffer stock theory of money demand are to be found in Darby (1972). He proposed that money balances serve as a shock absorber or buffer stock which temporarily absorbs unexpected variations in income (transitory income), until the portfolio of securities and consumer durable goods can be adjusted. Another shock may come from unexpected changes in the nominal money supply. If the Bank of England increases the money supply by open market operations, the first effect will be on the price of Treasury Bills. This impact will quickly move to the price of other securities. As this process takes place, investors will find that they cannot obtain their expected yield from their original portfolio, some will choose to hold larger cash balances, others will sell assets. Credit will be easily available, and the application for loans approved more quickly. The inverse of this process would be an unexpected decline in the money supply, unexpected low asset prices, slow sales, restricted credit availability, which in turn could lead to individuals calling upon their cash reserves. The role of money supply shocks can be best summed up by Carr and Darby (1981):

"... money supply shocks will affect the synchronization of purchases and sales of assets and so engender a temporary desire to hold more or less money than would have otherwise be the case."

(Carr and Darby (1981) p.187)
In order to translate this theoretical model into an empirical one the basic starting point is Chow (1966). Carr and Darby’s discussion suggests using two modifications to the basic Chow mechanism: (1) addition of a transitory income term, (2) addition of a money supply shock term. The shock absorber version of the Chow mechanism is thus:

$$m_t = \lambda m_{t-1}^p + (1-\lambda) m_t + By_t + \phi \hat{\theta}_t$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.18)

where $y_t^r = y_t - y_{t-1}^p$, $y = \text{logarithm of real income}$, $y_{t-1}^p = \text{logarithm of real permanent income}$, $m_t = M_t - P_t$, $M = \text{logarithm of the nominal money supply}$, $P = \text{logarithm of the price level}$, $M^* = \text{the logarithm of the expected money supply}$, (generated using an univariate ARIMA process), $\hat{\theta}_t = M_t - M_t^*$ = the money supply shock.

Carr and Darby’s preferred long-run money demand function is:

$$m_t^d = Y_0 + Y_1 y_t^r + Y_2 R^r$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.19)

where $R = \text{the nominal rate of interest}$. Combining (3.18) and (3.19) we get the estimating equation:

$$m_t = \lambda Y_0 + \lambda Y_1 y_{t-1}^r + \lambda Y_2 R_{t-1} + (1-\lambda) m_{t-1} + By_t + \phi \hat{\theta}_t$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.20)

Simultaneity bias arises because $y_t^r$, $R$, $y_t^r$, $M$, are all determined simultaneously with $m_t$ and so are likely to be correlated with the stochastic disturbance in (3.20). Also, using ordinary least squares would induce a positive bias in the coefficient of $M$.

Carr and Darby’s results using United Kingdom quarterly data 1957I to 1976IV are as follows:
\[ m_t = 0.0353 + 0.0148y_t^2 - 0.4232R_t + 0.9713m_{t-1} + 0.0929y_t^2 + 0.8541\hat{g}_t \quad (3.21) \]

(0.298) (0.730) (3.363) (19.316) (0.746) (7.848)

s.e. = 0.0148  \[ R^2 = 0.9502 \quad h = 0.280; \] t statistics in parenthesis.

The policy implication of the shock absorber model is that money supply shocks will induce smaller interest fluctuations than a conventional model.

The question of velocity and the variability of unanticipated and anticipated monetary growth has returned to the forefront of literature in mid 1980s following a uniform decline in velocity after 1980 in the United Kingdom, reversing the steady increase during the post war period. Friedman (1983, 1984) argues that this is due to a more volatile money supply growth, and looks upon money as a shock absorber which smooths temporarily the economy's response to unanticipated changes in the money supply. However, Goodhart (1986, 1989) argues that the behavioural change is due to the impact of "financial innovation" on money demand. Indeed a whole sub-group of literature testing the relationship between velocity and the variability of unanticipated and anticipated monetary growth has developed using tests for causality developed by Granger (1980). The main arguments can be found in Thornton (1991) based on earlier work by Serletis (1990). He finds evidence that money growth and its variability have had a "causal" impact on velocity growth, and that one should not attribute any greater importance to unanticipated over anticipated variables in their influence. However, there are some doubts about the methodological robustness of the arguments presented. The first problem concerns unit roots. Sims, Stock,
and Watson (1986) point out that the asymptotic distributions of causality tests are sensitive to the presence of unit roots and time trends in the series. However, this is not the universal picture, for Christiano and Ljungqvist (1987) argue that the distortions introduced by unit roots being present may not be large enough to affect the results, and that differencing, may lead to causality tests lacking power. In light of this alternative view, it is important to test for the presence of unit roots in the velocity series and the volatility variables. As Mehra (1989) points out:

"At the minimum, the causality test results should be checked for their robustness to differencing and the treatment of trend."

(Mehra (1989) p.263)

The second problem concerns the selection of lag lengths. In estimating the Granger causality tests most authors choose "arbitrarily" lag lengths. It is well known that the results from such tests are sensitive to the selection of lag length. If the lags are too short, biased estimates result which will give misleading results. If the lags are too long, the estimates will be unbiased, but inefficient. Thornton and Batten (1985) have looked at this problem in great detail, and conclude that the Final Prediction Error Test (FPE) suggested by Hsiao (1981) is the best criterion for choosing lag lengths. A third problem concerns the Granger two step procedure itself. This produces biased estimates of the standard errors, as it treats the anticipated and unanticipated monetary variables as known data rather than statistical estimates. (see Pagan, (1984)). An alternative would have been to use a one step procedure and treat
the two equations as a system. Given the problems outlined above there remains some controversy concerning velocity and the variability of unanticipated and anticipated monetary growth in the United Kingdom.

3.5 Inflation Influences on Velocity

Another causal factor which we have already mentioned in passing is the expected rate of inflation. This represents the opportunity cost of holding money. The demand for money is inversely related to the expected rate of inflation. The main cost of holding transaction balances is the rate of depreciation of the value of money, that is the rate of growth of prices. Therefore, when inflation expectations are falling, the demand for money should rise, and the velocity of money should fall. The significance of the expected rate of inflation is well established in empirical work. Cagan (1956) used an error learning process to measure expected inflation, which he assumed was a good simulation of rational behaviour. However, Jacobs (1975) criticised Cagan's statistical methods, which he suggested exaggerated the strength of correlation between variables. Early studies using United States data by Selden (1956) and Friedman (1959) did not find any systematic relationship between the demand for money and the rate of inflation. In an earlier paper, however, Brown (1939) found that variations in the inflation rate influenced the demand for idle balances. However, work carried out two decades later on a more comprehensive set of post Second World War data by Shapiro (1973), who measured the expected inflation rate using weighted average of past actual rates, and
Goldfeld (1973) where expectations were based on opinion from survey data, found that a relationship did exist. While the expected rate of growth of prices has a direct influence on the demand for money and in consequence the velocity of circulation, it should be remembered that there is a secondary effect on nominal interest rates, which should vary systematically with the expected rate of inflation. Parkin and Laidler (1975) confirm this argument, but point out that variations in nominal interest rates do not fully reflect changes in the expected inflation rate. They suggest that there is a direct role for the expected inflation ratio. Indeed, Baba, Hendry, and Starr (1992) argue that the inflation rate and interest rate are not highly correlated and that both should be included in the demand for money function. This issue also is discussed by Brown (1939), Melitz (1976), Shapiro (1973), and Goldfeld (1973) whose empirical work contains both an expected inflation rate, and nominal interest rate. An attempt to measure the influence of the real rate of interest directly is given by Hamburger (1966,1977) who uses the dividend. This is an area since developed by Friedman (1988), and is an issue that will be considered again under financial innovations later in this thesis.

3.6 The Influence of Foreign Interest Rates

The work which has been reviewed so far has been concerned only with the domestic influences upon the velocity of circulation. However, over the last decade empirical work has looked at the demand for money in open economies. These studies have included as explanatory variables measures of the rate of return on
foreign currencies and foreign securities. The most prominent pieces of work in this area have been Arango and Nadiri (1981), Bordo and Choudhri (1982), Brittain (1981), Cuddington (1983), McKinnon (1982) and Miles (1978). Nonetheless, their success in introducing non domestic causal factors has been mixed. However, for the purposes of this study Brittain is of the most interest. Brittain (1981) introduces a model of the following form:

\[
\frac{Y}{M_d} = a + b \frac{Y}{M_d}_{t-1} + c \ r_d + d \ (r_f - r_d) + u
\]

(3.22)

where \( r_d \) is a domestic rate of interest, \( r_f \) is a foreign rate of interest, and \( (r_f - r_d) \) is the foreign portfolio variable. Since a rise in domestic interest rates \( r_d \) increases the opportunity cost of holding domestic currency, there should be a decline in \( M_d \) and a rise in domestic velocity \( (Y/M_d) \). By contrast a rise in foreign interest rates \( r_f \) increases the opportunity cost of holding foreign currency, and should lead to an increase in the demand for domestic currency \( (M_d) \) and a reduction in domestic velocity. These arguments suggest a negative coefficient on the portfolio variable. Brittain (1981) estimated the theoretical equation for the United Kingdom using quarterly data for the period 1963 I to 1979 II where the rate of return on 90 day German Treasury bills was used for the foreign rate of interest. Of the countries examined by Brittain the United Kingdom provided the least support for the foreign portfolio hypothesis. While a variety of money measures using both quarterly and annual data produced coefficients on the foreign portfolio measure of the correct sign, half of these were insignificantly different from zero and the residuals showed a high degree of serial correlation. The reason put forward for this poor performance has
been the existence of British exchange controls until the early 1980s.

3.7 The Value of Time and the Velocity of Circulation

With the rise of Friedman's Permanent Income Hypothesis the Keynesian tradition of breaking the demand for money into separate components, of transactions, precautionary and speculative balances was for the most part neglected. However Karni (1974) suggested that the distribution of money between its component parts still plays an important role. He suggests that ceteris paribus the demand for real money holdings is positively related to the real value of time. This is due to the fact that individuals and firms wish to save time when conducting their exchange activities. Karni's hypothesis is stated in the form of an inventory model of the demand for money, by assuming that cash withdrawal involves a cost in terms of goods and time, that is forgone earnings. He suggests that the elasticity of the demand for money with respect to real hourly earnings is larger than the elasticity of the demand for money with respect to property income or per capita hours worked. In consequence as the real value of time increases economic agents will spend less time carrying out their transactions and demand larger money balances which in turn will lower the velocity of circulation.
3.8 Exogenous short term shocks to nominal income

So far consideration has been made of those factors which determine the numerator of the velocity ratio, that is the demand for money. Just as important are those factors which have short run shocks on the numerator, that is nominal income. Tatam (1983) has suggested a number of causal components in this area. First he suggests that high employment expenditures by governments in the form of fiscal spending are likely to affect nominal income at least temporarily. It is expected that in a dynamic specification government expenditure is positively related to velocity. Another factor is labour strikes which lower both production and spending. Tatam measures this as the ratio of working days lost by strikes to labour force employed. Here a negative relationship is expected. The third influence concerns inventories and imports. In the last phase of the business cycle sales fall. If this is not anticipated production schedules may not be altered quickly and inventories rise more than planned. As inventory investment is included in the calculation of expenditure based GDP, this can lead to output being stronger than desired expenditure. A positive relationship between inventories and velocity is expected. Furthermore, if money demanded is to be used in the purchase of imports, this can cause the velocity ratio to fall as the denominator rises and the numerator remains constant, given the fact that imports are not included in GDP. In consequence a negative relationship between imports and velocity of circulation is anticipated. Another exogenous shock to the numerator are foreign energy and raw material prices. Beckerman (1985) and Beckerman and Jenkinson
(1986) claim that unemployment has no stable impact on inflation, which is in fact determined in the main by import prices. Tatom (1983) proceeds to estimate a model using explanations stressing the exogenous short term shocks which have an impact on nominal income for the United States, using quarterly data for the period 1948III to 1981III. The results were as follows.

\[
V_t = 3.825 - 0.801 \Delta M_t - 0.555 \Delta M_{t-1} - 0.371 \Delta M_{t-2} - 0.248 \Delta M_{t-3} - 0.188 \Delta M_{t-4} + 0.032 E_t - 0.005 E_{t-1} - 0.029 E_{t-2} - 0.004 E_{t-3} - 0.855 G_t + 0.015 r_t + 0.443 \Delta P_t - 0.248 \Delta S_t - 0.040 p^*_t + 0.030 p^*_{t-1} + 0.077 p^*_{t-2}
\]

\[
(9.49) \quad (11.10) \quad (6.44) \quad (3.80) \quad (2.79) \quad (2.22) \quad (2.74) \quad (0.41) \quad (2.46) \quad (3.85) \quad (15.88) \quad (1.16) \quad (6.96) \quad (4.13) \quad (2.08) \quad (1.39) \quad (3.40)
\]

\[
R^2 = 0.80 \quad \text{s.e.} = 1.94 \quad \text{D.W.} = 2.01 \quad \rho = 0.45
\]

where \( M \) = the money stock, \( E \) = high employment expenditures, the difference between trend and actual government expenditure, \( G \) = the GDP gap, the difference between trend GDP and actual GDP, \( r \) = short term interest rate (Aaa bond yield), \( P \) = GDP price deflator, \( S \) = strikes, measured by days lost due to strikes relative to the size of the civilian labour force, \( p^*_t \) = relative price of energy, measured by the producer price of fuel and related products and power, deflated by the business sector
implicit price deflator. While the equation performs well, it has been corrected for autocorrelation. The correction, and the manner in which it is corrected, will be one of the major issues which will be considered in more detail later in this chapter.

Later literature considers further factors which are assumed to have an impact on nominal income. McGibany and Nourzad (1985) argue that there is a direct relationship between income tax rates and the velocity of money. The authors base their arguments on Holmes and Smyth (1972) who claim that:

"Given the importance of tax deductions at source, the flow of receipts relevant to households' money holdings decision is surely income after taxes, (personal disposable income) rather than national income."

(Holmes and Smyth (1972) p.179)

It follows that for a given national income, a reduction in taxes increases personal disposable income. This, Ricardian equivalence apart, leads to an increase in consumption, which in turn leads to a rise in the demand for transaction balances. Accordingly in the short run a reduction in taxes results in a decline in the velocity of money. Hence a positive parameter on the standard rate of tax is expected. It must be remembered that while the decrease in the tax rate increases the demand for money balances in the velocity ratio, the numerator for the most part does not change, unless disposable income is used to measure transactions so that taxation is taken into account. McGibany and Nourzad test their hypothesis using quarterly data for the period 1948:1 to
3.9 Long Run Behaviour of the Velocity of Circulation

The majority of the work reviewed so far, has concerned itself with the velocity of circulation, in the short run. However, over the last decade new work has considered the long run behaviour of the velocity of circulation, that is the secular behaviour of velocity. Figure 3.1 shows the stylized facts of velocity M3 for the United Kingdom using annual data for the period 1870-1988, and this exhibits a U-shaped pattern. Bordo and Jonung (1987) suggest that technical progress in the financial sector during the process of industrialization of a particular country accounts for this initial downward trend in velocity.
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During the 19th century, cash and demand deposits came into use as a means of settling transactions, replacing barter, and payments in kind. As monetization took place, demand for transactions balances grew more rapidly than income, and velocity declined. A corresponding influence on this fall in velocity was the rise of the commercial banking system which gave the general public deposit facilities. However, with growing financial sophistication velocity began to exhibit an upward trend by the middle of this century. It is often suggested that this was due to the development of a large number of close substitutes for money, such as stocks, bonds, and other fairly liquid assets, together with the advent of forms of payment not requiring money balances, such as credit cards, electronic transfers and cash management techniques. As Clower (1969) points out, the more advanced the market economy becomes, the method of payment chosen will be that with the lowest transaction costs. These changes tend to reduce the transactions demand for measured money. Furthermore, with growing economic security and stability brought about by the modern welfare state and policies which were aimed at maintaining full employment and providing free health care, individuals felt it less necessary to hold money balances as a contingency reserve against the unexpected. This upward trend in velocity continued until 1980 when a sharp decline took place, and the subsequent downturn has continued to the present day. It has been suggested that there are two reasons for this fall in velocity. First, Bordo and Jonung (1990) argue that it is due to the deregulation of the banking system, which in turn led to financial innovation. Banks, by paying interest on deposits and
expanding the number of banking services available, made the holding of money more attractive. This tended to raise the demand for money and thus lower velocity. Second, Friedman (1987) and Rasche (1989) suggest that the fall in velocity is due to disinflation.

In view of the fact that direct measures of long run institutional factors are unavailable, Bordo and Jonung (1987) developed a number of proxy variables. The first of these is the ratio of the number of people working in nonagricultural pursuits \((L_{NA})\) to the total number of people employed \((L)\) used as a proxy for monetization. This ratio will tend towards one as increased monetization takes place. Therefore, we expect a negative relationship with velocity. As the primary sector declines in importance the demand for money will rise. Capie and Wood (1986) suggest urbanization as an alternative measure to the share of the labour in non-agricultural production. That is the share of the population in major towns \((PCMPT)\). They argue that it is possible that industries in rural areas were slow to monetize, so that the Bordo and Jonung measure may be misleading.

The second proxy employed is for the spread of commercial banking which is measured as the currency-money ratio \((OM)\), that is the currency notes and coins in circulation outside the Bank of England \((C)\), divided by the total stock of money as measured by M3. It is expected that the currency money ratio \((OM)\) will be negatively correlated with the monetization of the economy, and thus be positively correlated with velocity. Capie and Wood
(1986) suggest that the currency deposit ratio is a better measure than the currency/money ratio because it is sharper moving. They also introduce three additional monetization variables: the number of bank branches, which will encourage monetization, bank deposits per head, and the number of cheque clearings per head.

The third proxy is the ratio of total non bank financial assets to total financial assets (TNBFA/TFA), a measure for financial development, which is expected to be related positively to velocity. Nevertheless, Capie and Wood (1986) have criticised this measure of financial evolution. They argue that the growth of non bank financial assets has been dominated by those assets which are not necessarily close substitutes for money. The authors suggest that this variable be disaggregated. In the personal sector they suggest the use of the growth of building society deposits, life assurance premiums, and pension funds. Another area for consideration as a replacement for the original variable is the growth of government securities, together with the increase of credit finance companies.

The final proxy is for economic stability, which should be negatively correlated with velocity. Following Bordo and Jonung (1987) this is measured as a six year moving standard deviation of the annual percentage change in real income per capita. In addition Capie and Wood (1986) use the percentage of GDP spent on social services, defined as education, health, social security, and unemployment benefits.
Bordo and Jonung (1987) proceed to estimate two equations for the United Kingdom using annual data: The first is the benchmark equation which is similar to the conventional equations discussed above:

\[ \ln v_t = B_0 + B_1 \ln y^P_t + B_2 i_t + B_3 \ln(\text{cycle})_t + e_t \]  

(3.24)

where \( B_1, B_2, B_3 > 0 \)

and where permanent income \( (y^P) \) and an interest rate \( (i) \) jointly determine the time path of velocity \( (v) \). The cycle variable which is measured as the ratio of real per capita income to real per capita permanent income reflects the short run effects of business cycles. The authors build upon the benchmark equation to attempt to capture the role of institutional factors outlined above. The second equation is a revised specification which takes the form:

\[ \ln v_t = B_0 + B_1 \ln y^P_t + B_2 i_t + B_3 \ln(\text{cycle})_t + B_4(\text{LNA/L})_t + B_5 \ln(C/M)_t + B_6 \ln(\text{TNBFA/TFA})_t + B_7 \ln \text{YSD} + e'_t \]  

(3.25)

where \( B_4, B_5, B_6, B_7 > 0, B_1, B_2, B_3 < 0 \)

and where \( \text{LNA/L} = \) the share of the labour force in non agricultural pursuits, \( C/M = \) the currency-money ratio, \( \text{TNBFA/TFA} = \) the ratio of total non-bank financial assets to total financial assets, \( \text{YSD} = \) a six year moving standard deviation of the annual percentage change in real per capita income.

In estimating the benchmark equation using annual United Kingdom data for the period 1876-1974 and correcting for autocorrelation using the Cochrane-Orcutt method \( AR(2) \), Bordo and Jonung obtained the following results:
\[ \ln v_t = 0.094 + 0.0651 \ln y^t + 1.651 i_t + 0.650 \ln(\text{cycle})_t \]  
\[ (0.095) \quad (0.419) \quad (3.352) \quad (3.287) \]
\[ R^2 = 0.907 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.05 \quad \text{D.W.} = 1.790 \quad p = 0.939 \]
\[(t \text{ statistics in parenthesis)}\]

All parameters are of the correct sign, but while the parameters on the short term interest rate and the log of cycle are significantly different from zero at the 95% significance level, the parameter on the log of permanent income (and the constant) is not significantly different from zero. An \( R^2 \) of 0.907 suggests quite a good fit, but it is a relationship where just two regressors play a significant part. The Durbin-Watson statistic suggests that the autocorrelation has been corrected. Some more general criticisms of Bordo and Jonung's work will be considered in a moment, but first let us consider their expanded equation.

Once again it is based on annual data for the United Kingdom for the period 1876-1974 and has been corrected for autocorrelation. The results were as follows:

\[ \ln v_t = -0.3950 + 0.1971 \ln y^t + 2.497 i_t + 0.7970 \ln(\text{cycle})_t \]
\[ - 6.271 \ln (\text{LNA}/L)_t + 0.211 \ln (C/M)_t + 0.746 \ln(\text{TNBFA}/TFA)_t \]
\[ - 0.0341 \ln YSD_t \]
\[ (0.344) \quad (1.240) \quad (5.014) \quad (4.588) \]
\[ (2.313) \quad (2.167) \quad (3.107) \]
\[ (2.059) \]
\[ R^2 = 0.931 \quad n = 98 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.043 \quad \text{D.W.} = 2.081 \quad p = 0.925 \]

All parameters are of the correct sign. Nevertheless, the constant and the coefficient on permanent income fail to be significantly different from zero. The adjusted \( R^2 \) is fairly good, and the serial correlation has been corrected. However, a lack of statistical tests makes full analysis of their results, without re-estimating the model, impossible. We now turn to a
general criticism of Bordo and Jonung's empirical work. Given recent advances in econometric methodology we can raise a number of econometric objections to the manner in which the authors proceed with their estimation. The first problem was the severe positive serial autocorrelation in the residuals of the ordinary least squares estimation, which they chose to correct using the Cochrane-Orcutt technique.

Hendry and Mizon (1978) suggest that serial correlation in this context may be evidence of model mis-specification. The second problem is that it is now clear that many economic time series contain a unit root (see Nelson and Plosser (1982)), which, according to certain authors, include the income velocity series. (see Gould and Nelson (1974) and Gould et al. (1978)). As a result of these and similar observations, it is argued that time series with a unit root are best analyzed in first differences or rates of growth, rather than levels. Raj and Siklos (1988) re-estimated Bordo and Jonung's equations in first differences and found evidence unfavourable for the institutional hypothesis. However, attempting to model the dynamics at this stage may merely serve to obscure the set of explanatory variables which is sufficient or necessary to adequately model the series. If a valid dynamic model of the velocity of circulation is to exist it must contain a set of variables which satisfies the tests of cointegration which are applied at the initial part of the estimation procedure. Indeed, even Raj and Siklos (1988) neglect to add the conditions outlined above and this may lead to spurious regression problems and to equations which may not be
structurally stable, as suggested by Granger and Newbold (1974). This leads us to the general criticism that previous literature fails to take account of the developments in cointegration and error correction models, the two exceptions being an unpublished working paper by Siklos (1989), and Siklos (1993). These arguments are considered more fully in chapter five.

3.10 Financial Innovation

As discussed earlier, one possible reason for the downturn in velocity since 1980 has been financial innovation, following deregulation of the banking system. A full review of issues concerning financial innovation is given in Podolski (1986), and more recently by Arestis et al. (1992). According to Johnston (1984) there are two approaches in dealing with financial innovation in empirical work. The first is to redefine the dependent variable by including new money substitutes in the definition of money. This will be dealt with comprehensively in chapter four when the different definitions of velocity are considered. The second approach is to introduce new "innovative variables" among the regressors. These innovation variables are designed to convey developments in the payments and transaction system. It is this issue which is of concern here.

The first financial innovation variable to be considered is the number of automatic teller machines or cash dispensers. These increase personal accessibility to money when banks are closed, or crowded, and in locations away from bank branches such as shopping malls and superstores. Johnston (1984) is uncertain what
the implications have been on personal sector cash holdings. In some instances they encourage greater use of cash in making transactions. However, equally valid is the view that individuals may reduce the average inventory of cash which they hold. So the expected sign on this parameter is unclear.

The second financial innovation variable is the number of credit cards. These have risen rapidly since their introduction, apart from a slight decline in the early 1990s following the introduction of an annual charge. A credit card concentrates a number of transactions into one single monthly payment, which is usually settled by a transfer and not cash. Therefore individuals tend to economise on cheques, and thus average holdings in cheque accounts and cash holdings. In consequence this leads to a reduction in the demand for money, and an increase in the velocity of money. Thus a positive relationship is to be expected.

The third innovation variable concerns the growth in the number of Bank current accounts and Building Society share accounts since the Second World War. One reason for this has been the move away from wage and salary payment by cash towards cheque and electronic transfers. According to Johnston (1984) cash payments accounted for 75% of wage payments in 1960. However, by 1981 this had fallen to 44%, whereas credit transfer of wage payments rose from 15% to 38% during the same period. Furthermore, a cheque can be seen as a close substitute for payments in cash particularly where large amounts are concerned. The Bank of England (1982) has
attempted to measure the influence of unemployment on the volume of wages paid in cash. As unemployment rises the demand for cash balances to pay employees falls. All the above arguments decrease the need for cash balances, and thus a positive relationship with velocity is to be expected.

The fourth new variable is the interest rate ratchet, defined as the previous peak level of interest rates. Goldfeld (1973) suggests that there are fixed costs with altering cash management techniques. Economic agents will only change to more efficient cash management techniques when it is worthwhile, for instance when interest rates rise to new high levels. However, these new techniques may not be abandoned when interest rates subsequently fall. Goldfeld (1973) thus suggests that there is a ratchet effect in the demand for money, and argues that a simple way to measure this phenomenon is to use the previous peak level of interest rates. Here, a positive relationship is to be expected.

The final area concerning the financial innovations which have been taking place, is the rapid growth of the stock market, and in particular the growth of electronic trading. This has made the role of the Stock Market more important in recent years. According to Friedman (1988) the role of the stock market in affecting velocity has to be taken into account in two ways: (a) treating the volume of financial transactions created by the market as an argument in the demand for money function, on the principle that these transactions will "absorb" money, and hence reduce income velocity and (b) by following Hamburger (1966,
1977) and taking the earnings or dividend yield on securities as an alternative measure of return to money in the individual's portfolio.

Friedman (1988) also argues that there is an inverse relationship between stock market prices and monetary velocity. He suggests that this can be rationalised in three ways: (a) A rise in stock market prices means an increase in nominal wealth and given that there is usually a wider fluctuation in stock market prices than in income, also in the ratio of wealth to income. The higher wealth to income ratio will be reflected in a higher money to income ratio and thus a lower velocity, (b) a rise in stock market prices reflects an increase in the expected return on risky assets relative to safe assets. Such a change in relative valuation may not be accompanied by a lower degree of risk aversion or greater risk preference. Indeed the resulting increase in risk could be offset by increasing the weight of relative safe assets in an aggregate portfolio, (c) a rise in stock market prices may imply a rise in nominal volume in value terms of financial transactions, increasing the demand for money to undertake such transactions.

In order to measure the influence of stock market behaviour on the velocity of circulation a number of independent variables have been suggested by empirical work. These include real stock market price, Financial Times earnings yield, and the ratio of Treasury Bonds Long to Short rates. All three variables will be considered in subsequent chapters.
This chapter has revealed that the velocity of circulation of money - at least in the short run - can be sensitive to a large number of factors. Given that velocity is measured as a ratio of two important macroeconomic variables this is not entirely surprising. However, it makes any attempt at modelling velocity a very difficult task. On the one hand there are those structural variables which determine the long run behaviour of velocity. These can be divided into three types. The use of monetization variables, epitomizes the period when the demand for transaction balances grew more rapidly than income. The financial sophistication variables representing the development of a large number of close substitutes for money such as stocks and bonds, and payment methods not requiring currency. The latter are being further represented by the financial innovation variables. Finally, there are those variables associated with the short run dynamic behaviour of velocity. These can be further divided into demand for money variables - interest rates, wealth, and price expectations - and those affecting nominal income - fiscal policy, labour strikes, and foreign energy and raw material prices.

However, before we can construct an econometric model of velocity behaviour, we need to address the definition of those variables outlined in this chapter. In particular we need to examine the measurement problems in relation to the velocity variable, what constitutes money and what is the most appropriate measure of transactions. First we consider the advances which have taken
place in econometrics during the last decade, which bring into doubt the validity of earlier empirical work.
Chapter 4

Criticalism of the Methodology used in Earlier Literature and the Advent of Cointegration

4.1 Introduction

As discussed earlier, the most comprehensive empirical work on income velocity is Bordo and Jonung (1987, 1990). Yet given recent developments in econometric methodology, in particular cointegration, their results are open to question. This chapter charts the advent of cointegration, and introduces the estimation strategy to be used in this thesis.

4.2 Background to Cointegration

There have been perhaps three major developing themes in econometric analysis in the last decade, which led ultimately to the advent of cointegration analysis; spurious correlation; stationarity; and error correction models. Consequently the reliability of much of the earlier empirical work on the velocity of circulation may be in doubt. It is the consideration of this possibility, that is one of the main themes of this thesis. Let us consider briefly each of the areas outlined above.

The fact that there is a high correlation between two variables, does not necessarily mean that there exists a causal relationship between them. There needs to be some economic meaning to the relationship. For example Hendry (1980), found that there was a statistical relationship between rainfall and inflation. There is of course no theoretical reason for this being the case, and such relationships, lead to what is known as spurious correlation. One reason for two variables being highly correlated
in this way, is when they both share a common trend. Another, suggested by Granger and Newbold (1974) is the presence of autocorrelated disturbances, which leads to i) inefficient estimates of the regression coefficients, ii) sub-optimal forecasts and iii) invalid standard statistical significance tests.

The second development is derived from the time series literature, and concerns the concept of stationarity. A stochastic process is said to be stationary, if the joint and conditional probability distributions of the process are unchanged through the passage of time. In practice, according to Spanos (1986, pp.137-140), a stochastic process is said to be stationary if its means and variances are constant over time, and the covariances between subsequent time periods, depends only on the gap between these periods. In reality very few time series are stationary, and many have trends, leading to the problem of spurious correlation discussed above. However, a nonstationary series can be transformed into a stationary one by differencing d times, and when stationarity is achieved the variable in question is said to be integrated of order d. A series is said to be integrated of order one, I(1), if it has to be differenced once before stationarity is obtained, or order two, I(2), if it has to be differenced twice before stationarity is achieved.
The last development concerns the concept of error correction models. Here econometric modellers are concerned not only with the dynamics of the short run, but also in the long run steady state relationship. Hence, while the short run dynamic model may have rates of growth, and a generous lag structure, in the long run the rates of growth are zero or non-zero constants, the lag structures disappear, and the model is solved in levels. Thus the long run model introduces a theoretical foundation to the short run dynamic model.

4.3 Cointegration

The idea of cointegration was first introduced by Granger and Weiss (1983), and development continued in Engle and Granger (1987). If two series are cointegrated there exists an error correction model which can potentially improve short run forecasts, but which particularly affects the quality of long run forecasts. The general approach to cointegration followed in this thesis is the Engle and Granger (1987) two-step-method, together with subsequent developments by Johansen (1988), as discussed later. The initial step is the estimation of the long run equilibrium relationship, the second step the estimation of the dynamic short run relationship. In order to carry out the two-step-method, we first consider the degree of integration of individual variables which are proposed for the cointegrating or long run equation. It is possible that two variables $x_1$ and $x_2$ which are both integrated of the same order, give rise to a linear combination with stationary residuals

$$e = x_1 - \lambda x_2$$

(4.1)

that is integrated of degree zero, in other words $e$ is $I(0)$. In
such a case we say that $x_t$ and $x_s$ are cointegrated. This concept can be extended to a multivariable model.

If there are only two variables in the long run equation, that is the dependent variable and one independent variable, both must have the same order of integration. However, if we have more than one independent variable the order of integration of the dependent variable cannot be higher than the order of integration of any one of the explanatory variables.

The next task is to derive and estimate the long run equation, and test for stationarity of the residuals which is necessary if the variables in question are to be cointegrated. Finally, we estimate a short-run dynamic equation, using the lagged residuals of the long run equation as an error correction term.

One major problem with the multivariable Engle and Granger two-step-method is that of uniqueness. To avoid this identification problem, a test is required to determine how many cointegrating vectors there are for a set of variables. The test usually used in general modelling strategy is that given by Johansen (1988) which is used to (i) determine the maximum number of cointegrating vectors for the variables of interest, and (ii) to obtain the maximum likelihood estimates of the cointegrating vector and adjustment parameters. Johansen (1988) achieves this by using canonical correcting methods and utilising the eigenvalues and eigen-vectors given by the matrix of correlation coefficients. It is this approach which is used in this thesis.
A full review of cointegration for applied economics can be found in Rao (1994).

### 4.4 Estimation Strategy

The overall conceptual approach to econometric modelling follows the L.S.E. tradition, using the general to specific methodology (see Hendry, Pagan and Sargan, 1984). At the heart of this approach is the idea of the data generation process, which is a general statement of the joint probability distribution of all possible variables. However, the data generation process contains far too many variables than can be dealt with efficiently or are of interest theoretically. Therefore a selection process is undertaken to produce a subset of variables of interest. Some variables are disregarded given the problem being considered. In consequence a simplified theoretical model is derived for estimation purposes, and the proposed functional form is chosen.

The next step is to consider the time series properties of the proposed variables, and check their order of integration. According to Holden and Thompson (1992) tests for stationarity fall into three categories; i) informal examination of correlograms; ii) Durbin-Watson statistical tests; iii) regression based t-tests, usually given the name of Dickey-Fuller tests.

The first category of tests is derived from the time series literature, and uses a correlogram graph. If the autocorrelations die away rapidly as time increases, then it is likely that the
series is stationary. However, if the autocorrelations are non-zero after a number of lags, then the series is probably not stationary. If this is the case, the series is differenced, and the graph is examined for a second time, and so on, until stationarity is achieved. The major problem is that of subjectivity, and for this reason the correlogram test will not be used in this thesis.

The earliest type of second category tests was suggested by Sargan and Bhargava (1983). They propose that the variable concerned is regressed on a constant, such that:

\[ Y_t = a_0 \]  

(4.2)

and then examining the cointegrating regression Durbin-Watson statistic (CRDW), which is given by:

\[ CRDW = \frac{\sum (e_t-e_{t-1})^2}{\sum (e_t^2)} \]  

(4.3)

where \( e_t \) is the residual. If the CRDW is close to zero, then \( Y \) is not stationary. Sargan and Bhargava (1983) produce tables of the relevant critical values, (see appendix B). If the calculated CRDW is greater than the tabulated critical value, then we conclude that \( Y \) is stationary.

An alternative literature provided more sophisticated tests, and these are commonly known as Dickey-Fuller statistics. These tests are conducted within the context of three types of generating process of a univariate series. First the mean of the series is zero, so

\[ Y_t = \beta Y_{t-1} + u_t \]  

(4.4)

Second the mean of the series is non-zero
Third the mean of the series is non-zero and there is a time trend

\[ Y_t = a_0 + a_1 Y_{t-1} + \gamma T + u_t \]  

(4.6)

The tests are designed to ascertain whether the value of \( a_1 \) is equal to 1, in which case \( Y \) is not stationary, or less than 1, in which case the \( Y \) series is stationary. An alternative way of expressing (4.4) is the following:

\[ Y_t - Y_{t-1} = (a_1-1) Y_{t-1} + u_t \]  

(4.7)

which can be rewritten as:

\[ \Delta Y_t = \beta Y_{t-1} + u_t \]  

(4.8)

where \( \beta = (a_1-1) \), and test of whether \( a_1 = 1 \) becomes a test of whether \( \beta = 0 \). Unfortunately the ordinary least squares estimate of \( \beta \) may be substantially biased in an autoregressive equation, and according to Charemza and Deadman (1992) little is known about the distribution of the Student t-test where the variable \( Y_t \) is nonstationary. Therefore it is necessary to use special modified t statistic tables produced by Fuller (1976). The null hypothesis is that \( Y_t \) is I(1), and this hypothesis is rejected if the computed t value is larger in absolute terms than the critical value for statistic \( T \) representing the modified t statistic). Rejection of the null hypothesis implies that \( Y_t \) is I(0). Acceptance of the null hypothesis implies that \( Y \) is a random walk without drift.

A similar test can be performed on a variable where the mean of the series is non-zero. (4.5) is rewritten as:
\( \Delta Y_t = \alpha_0 + \beta Y_{t-1} + \gamma T + \epsilon_t \) \hspace{1cm} (4.9)

Comparison is made between the t value for \( \beta \) and the critical value for \( \Gamma \) in tables 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 in Fuller (1976, pp. 371 and 373). The null hypothesis is that the series is I(1) and this is rejected if the value of the t statistic is a larger negative value than the tabulated one. If we cannot reject the null hypothesis, this implies \( Y_t \) is a random walk with drift. We can check the presence of drift by estimating \( \Delta Y \) on a constant and performing a standard t test on the constant. Furthermore it should be noted that according to Dolado and Jenkinson (1987), when drift is present the normal distribution rather than the special Dickey-Fuller statistics should be used.

Similarly the same test can be performed where the mean of the time series is non-zero and has a time trend. (4.6) is rewritten as:

\[ \Delta Y_t = \alpha_0 + \beta Y_{t-1} + \gamma T + \epsilon_t \] \hspace{1cm} (4.10)

Once again we compare the t value for \( \beta \) with the tabulated values given in Fuller (1976). As in the previous examples, the null hypothesis is that \( Y_t \) is I(1) and this is rejected if the t statistic computed has a larger negative value than the critical value. This test requires \( \gamma \), the coefficient on \( T \), to be zero. We test for this using a standard F test that both \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) are zero. The estimated value of F is then compared with the critical value for \( \phi \), contained in Dickey and Fuller (1981, pp.1062-1063).

Unfortunately there is a problem with the basic Dickey-Fuller (DF) tests. The estimated residuals are not free from
autocorrelation, and this invalidates the tests. Consequently they are not used in this thesis. However, this problem is overcome by introducing the lagged dependent variable into the equation, and this approach is called the Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test (ADF). This gives the equation:

\[ \Delta Y_t = \delta_0 + \beta Y_{t-1} + \gamma T + \delta_1 \Delta Y_{t-1} + \delta_2 \Delta Y_{t-2} + \ldots + \delta_n \Delta Y_{t-n} + \varepsilon_t \]  

(4.11)

The number of lags is equal to that which eliminates autocorrelation from the residuals, which can be tested using the standard Lagrange-Multiplier (LM) test. One problem with the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) statistic is that the inclusion of the lagged values of \( \Delta Y \) results in a loss of degrees of freedom, but with over one hundred and twenty annual observations this is not a major problem in our case. The Augmented Dickey Fuller regression is estimated for each variable and the corresponding statistics computed. These are used to establish the type of series using the excellent sequential method suggested by Holden and Perman (1994).

According to Perron (1989), unit roots which do not take into account the possibility of structural breaks may have low power. Therefore, the procedure developed by Perron (1989, 1994) to test for unit roots in the presence of possible structural breaks is used for each variable. The detailed exposition of this procedure is left until chapter seven.

As Holden and Thompson (1992) point out in reviewing a general modelling strategy for the Johansen procedure for determining the
number of cointegrating vectors:
"Usually only I(1) variables will occur in any long-run relationship"

(Holden and Thompson, 1992, p.35)

As Engle and Granger (1991) further observe:
"Often researchers would like to include in the cointegrating relationship variables which are not I(1). In principle, inclusion of a stationary variable is prohibited"

(Engle and Granger, 1991, p.14)

In consequence, those variables which are not I(1) are rejected, and the model(s) for estimation further simplified.

Before applying Johansen's estimation procedure, it is necessary to determine the lag length $k$ of the VAR (vector autoregressive model). According to Sedgley and Smith (1994):

"this should be high enough to ensure that errors are approximately white noise, but small enough to enable estimation"

(Sedgley and Smith, 1994, p.141)

According to Perron (1994) there is evidence to suggest that data dependent techniques to select the lag parameter $k$ gives test statistics which have better properties, that is stable size and higher power, than a fixed $k$ a priori. There are three methods of choosing lag length. The first is the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC), where $k$ is chosen by selecting the lag length which minimises the value of the test. However, Perron (1994) criticises this method:
"Data-dependent methods based on information criteria, such as the A.I.C., tend to select very parsimonious models leading to tests with sometimes serious size distortions. This finite sample performance is consistent with our findings that the use of an information criterion leads to a selected value of k that increases to infinity, as T [the sample size] increases, only at rate log(T), a very slow rate. These theoretical results are in accord with the empirical results .... based on the A.I.C. lead to very small values of k being selected (typically 0 or 1). This suspicion about the performance of data based methods used by the A.I.C. is reinforced by the fact that often the estimated residuals exhibit serial correlation."

(Perron, 1994, page 139)

An alternative is to use sequential F tests. Initially a large value of k is selected and the following equation is estimated:

\[ Y_t = \beta + \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i Y_{t-i} + \epsilon_t \quad (4.12) \]

This specification is reestimated for ever smaller values of k. The likelihood ratio tests are then used to ascertain the smallest lag length which is acceptable. Finally there is Perron’s (1989) recursive t-statistic procedure. This:

"... uses a general to specific recursive procedure based on the value of the t-statistic on the coefficient associated with the last lag in the estimated autoregression. More specifically, the procedure selects that value of k, say k', such that the coefficient on the last lag in an autoregression of order k' is significant and that the coefficient on the last lag in an autoregressive of order greater than k' is insignificant, up to
some maximum order $k_{\text{max}}$ selected a priori."

(Perron, 1994, page 138)

This is the procedure adopted by this thesis. To confirm residual whiteness, standard serial correlation tests and A.D.F. tests are carried out.

It should also be noted, that the smaller the sample size and the higher the number of independent variables, the smaller will be the degrees of freedom, and the power of the Johansen tests will be reduced.

Once the lag length is determined, the next step is to use the Johansen cointegration LR tests based on the maximum eigenvalue of the stochastic matrix, and on the trace of the stochastic matrix, to determine the number of cointegrating vectors. However the two Johansen test statistics may give conflicting results. According to Johansen (1991) this disagreement is due to the complication the test statistics face when the cointegration relationship is quite close to the nonstationary boundary. He further suggests, that the ambiguity of the test statistics in empirical work is due to the slow speed of adjustment to the hypothetical equilibrium state. This may be due to high adjustment costs, regulations, or short run effects which keep the process away from the equilibrium path. Johansen and Juselius (1992), argue that the final number of cointegrating vectors which are accepted is determined by three factors, the formal test results outlined above, the estimated coefficients obtained, and the graphs of the long-run relationships.
The formal Johansen tests establish the possible number of cointegrating vectors. The next step is to estimate these vectors. The estimated normalized parameters of these vectors, their sign, size and relationship with economic theory are then explained. The vector must also satisfy the restrictions of economic theory. Using the likelihood ratio statistic suggested by Johansen (1988), it is possible to check that all parameters are significantly different from zero. The $\chi^2$ statistic is compared with its 5% critical value. If a vector passes all of these tests, it is selected as a candidate for the long run cointegrating vector and its lagged residuals are used as an error correction term in the short run dynamic equation. If more than one vector is suitable, then it may be possible to solve this dilemma by considering the graphs produced by the residuals of these vectors. These are in two forms. First $\beta', X$ describes the actual deviation from the equilibrium path as a function of short run effects. Second, the graph of the cointegrated relationship corrected for short-run dynamics, $\beta'R_m$. According to Johansen and Juselius (1992) the latter are of more use, for they illustrate the ability of the model to move towards the equilibrium state space, although this may never occur given a variety of exogenous shocks. If graphical interpretation cannot resolve the dispute between vectors, experimentation with short run dynamic equations and consideration of their performance is another path to follow. If no vector passes the above tests, the basic model is simplified until either no or acceptable long run cointegrating vector is found.
Once the long run cointegrating vector has been established, one proceeds to estimate the short run dynamic model, using ordinary least squares, with the lagged values of the residuals for the appropriate vector, included as an error correction mechanism. This should appear with a negative sign on their coefficient. According to Holden and Thompson (1992):

"If economic theory suggests that any additional variables affect short-run behaviour, these can be added at this stage"

Holden and Thompson (1992, p.36)

Nevertheless, there are rules governing their order of integration, as Holden and Thompson further state:

"It is also permissible to incorporate lagged first differences of other I(1) variables suggested by economic theory. These variables will have a short-run impact on the relationship between X and Y but will not occur in the co-integration regression"

Holden and Thompson (1992, p.29)

In estimating the short run equations, the econometric methodology suggested by Hendry's work, (see Hendry, Pagan, and Sargan, 1984), will be used, that is from the general to the specific. In other words, a general model is adopted with a generous lag structure, which is simplified with the help of statistical tests, until an acceptable specific (parsimonious) model is derived. In estimating the relationship the procedure
adopted in MICROFIT 3.0 will be used, (see Pesaran and Pesaran, 1987 and 1991). We therefore use in a consistent way the barrage of diagnostic tests available. These tests including the Durbin-Watson statistic and Durbin's h statistic for autocorrelation.

Godfrey's test of residual serial correlation (F₁), (see Godfrey 1978a, 1978b). Ramsey's RESET test of functional form, (F₅), (see Ramsey 1969, 1970). Jarque-Bera's test of the normality of regression residuals, (χ²(2)), (see Jarque and Bera (1980); Bera and Jarque (1981)). Finally a test for heteroscedasticity, F₄. Where observations allow, two further tests are computed. The Predictive Failure Test (F₄₅), a test of adequacy of predictions. (see Chow(1960), Salkever (1976), Dufour (1980), Pesaran et al. (1985)). The Chow test of the regression coefficients (F₅). (Chow (1960), Pesaran et al (1985). In cases where the tests suggest the presence of a problem, the specification will be re-examined until an acceptable model is arrived at. In addition, a plot of actual and predicted values, together with a graphical representation of the residuals are examined, and the reason for any outliers considered. One of the main concerns of this thesis is parameter stability. An initial method is to use the techniques for testing the constancy of regression relationships over time suggested by Brown et al. (1975). These are usually shown in the form of two graphical representations. The first of these is a plot of cumulative sum of recursive residuals, with a pair of straight lines drawn at the 5% level of significance. If these are not crossed the null hypothesis that the regression model is correctly specified is accepted. This indicates that there are no systematic changes in the regression coefficients.
The second test is a plot of cumulative sum of squares of recursive residuals, together with a pair of straight lines representing the 5% critical values of this test. If neither line is violated, the null hypothesis is accepted that there is not a sudden departure from constancy of the estimated regression coefficients. If either CUSUM test suggests a problem it is possible to check each coefficient individually using plots of the recursive coefficients for the variables in the regression equation one at a time to see where the problem lies. In order to consider parameter stability still further, the complete estimation strategy is repeated for two sub periods 1870-1946 (falling income velocity) and 1950-1991 (rising income velocity). With the empirical work at hand an evaluation of hypotheses and theoretical model is undertaken.

4.5 Summary

Much of the econometric work in previous literature is now in doubt, given the advent of cointegration. This chapter has considered the concept and developed an estimation strategy to test the hypothesis stated earlier. Nevertheless, before empirical work can take place, it is necessary to define the concept of velocity more clearly.
Chapter 5

Measurement, Behaviour and Properties of Velocity

5.1 Introduction

The first task in analysing velocity behaviour is to find a suitable empirical measure for the variable to be explained. In theory this should be straightforward, velocity being the ratio of the value of goods and services to the stock of money. Unfortunately there are a variety of measures for both the numerator and denominator, and therefore a corresponding number of velocity measures. Even the Central Statistical Office definition is a compromise:

"The velocity of circulation ... is derived as the ratio of gross domestic product at current market prices ... to the money stock ... The use of GDP (Gross Domestic Product) - or any other national income or expenditure aggregate, eg. total domestic expenditure or total final expenditure - in this calculation must be regarded as a crude approximation of what is ideally wanted - namely the total value of transactions in the economy involving money. These aggregates are strictly unsuitable because they exclude the transfer between sectors and transactions within sectors (of which transactions in primary and intermediate output within the industrial and commercial sector are very important) and they include non-cash items such as imported income and income in kind. Use of GDP assumes a stable relationship over time between GDP and total transactions."

Central Statistical Office (1990, p.108)
5.2 Velocity - The Numerator

The empirical work reported in this thesis employs various forms of national income resulting in various measures of velocity. Indeed, following Rasche (1987), initially, Net National Product (NNP), Gross Domestic Product (Average Measure) (GDP_Average), Total Final Expenditure (TFE), and Personal Disposable Income (PDI) will be used. On the whole the adopted measure relies on the output approach, which measures transactions in terms of the value-added by each of the various sectors of the economy. In aggregating over the whole economy, each firm's value-added is being used - this being the value of its output minus the value of the inputs that it purchases from elsewhere. However, we will also be concerned with measuring transactions directly, that is adopting an approach which, because of the unavailability of official data, has been rather neglected. Nevertheless, as we saw in chapter two the concepts of transactions velocity and income velocity were at the heart of the argument between the "motion theorists" who suggest a purely mechanical notion of velocity, that is the relationship between distance and time, and the "cash balance theorists" who argue that the size of cash balances held is not dependent on the properties of coins, but on the need for money at any given time. In consequence, the velocity of circulation of money is inversely proportional to the demand for money balances.

It is also of interest to consider a broader measure of transactions, because it gives us the opportunity to distinguish between those transactions which are associated with final goods
and services and, thus, closely related to the level of national income, and those which are just related to financial transactions. The latter often permit a huge turnover on quite small balances, so that the transactions velocity of circulation is very much larger than if these were excluded. Furthermore, the velocity of business deposits, and therefore aggregate velocity will be influenced by variations in the velocity of deposits used by business for financial transactions. Therefore fluctuations in financial transactions will cause changes in velocity independently of changes in the production of goods and services. In Keynes’s (1930) view, income and transactions velocities will often deviate given a fixed money supply, because this may be used to facilitate financial transactions, which are highly volatile and speculative in nature. As Keynes (1930) states:

"the volume of trading in financial instruments ... is not only highly variable but has no close connection with the volume of output whether of capital goods or of consumption goods; for the current output of fixed capital is small compared with the existing stock of wealth, which in the present context we will call the volume of securities ... and the activity with which these securities are being passed around from hand to hand does not depend on the rate at which they are being added to."

(Keynes (1930) p.222)
Indeed Fisher (1911) distinguishes between the two types of transactions:

\[ MV = PT_1 + PT_2 \]  
\[ V = \frac{PT_1}{M} + \frac{PT_2}{M} \]  
\[ V = V^* + V^\pi \]  

where \( M \) = the stock of money, \( P \) = the price level, \( T_1 \) = goods and services transactions, \( T_2 \) = financial transactions, \( V \) = total velocity of circulation, \( V^* \) = the velocity of circulation of goods and services, \( V^\pi \) = the velocity of financial transactions.

However, the problem remains of how to measure transactions, when no official statistical data are available. Furthermore as Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal (1992) point out:

"A measure of total transactions has to incorporate all intermediate transactions (for raw materials, part finished goods); all transactions in second hand goods (including much spending on house purchase in the UK) and by far the greater part of financial and speculative transactions."

(Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal (1992) p.373)

There have been two approaches in the literature to measuring transactions. First, Cramer (1981a) provides a framework from which rough estimates of the total volume of transactions in the United Kingdom can be derived, by distinguishing between different types of transaction. Second, Keynes (1930) uses the total value of cheque clearings as an estimate of the number of total transactions incorporating all intermediate transactions.
This work was extended more recently by Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal (1992) who construct a transactions velocity series for the United Kingdom using bank clearing data. Below we consider both methods.

5.3 The Cramer Approach to the Measurement of Transactions

Cramer (1981a) estimates three components of PT without distinguishing between the price level and the volume of trade with all transactions being measured in current prices. The three categories are as follows: (i) current transactions, which include all transactions which are related to production, income, and expenditure, (ii) transfers, that is transfers of the private sector, public sector, and from Central Government to Local Government, and (iii) asset and portfolio adjustment. Total transactions is defined as follows:

\[ TT = CT + TF + APA \] (5.4)

where TT = total transactions, CT = current transactions, TF = transfer transactions, APA = asset and portfolio adjustment transactions. Let us consider each group individually. For full definitions, see appendix A. The full statistical data for the period can be found in the appendix C. This contains over sixty variables, more than seven thousand observations, and took nine months of work using the London School of Economics archives to complete. A full description of the methodology and techniques used to construct the transactions variable can be found in
chapter six. We return to consider the data in detail later, but first let us consider an alternative method of measurement.

5.4 The Keynes, Howells & Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal Approach to the Measurement of Transactions

Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal (1992) follow Keynes (1930) and use bank clearings as a method of generating a variable for transactions. In the 1930s it was fairly straightforward to use bank clearings, as the only real alternative was the use of currency. However, today members of the Association of Payments Clearing Systems (APACS) use a variety of payment methods, both physical and electronic.

The value of interbank clearings can be divided into three main categories: (1) bulk paper clearings: (2) high-value clearings (Town and CHAPS): and (3) electronic clearing (BACS Banks Automated Clearing System), used for regular transfers, wages, mortgage payments, and local taxes. As Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal wish to find a measure of personal sector transactions, they exclude Town Clearing (TOWNCL) because this is dominated by same day settlement for financial transactions between financial institutions. They also exclude CHAPS (Clearing House Automated Payments System) because this involves large financial sums over one hundred thousand pounds, usually involving house purchase and other large financial transactions. Therefore their definition of transactions becomes:

\[ \text{HBCLEAR} = \text{TBCLEAR} - \text{TOWNCL} - \text{CHAPS} + \text{ELECLEAR} \]  

where \( \text{HBCLEAR} \) = Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal definition
of personal sector transactions, $TBCLEAR = \text{total bank clearings (excluding electronic clearing and credit clearing)}$, $TOWNCL = \text{town clearing}$, $CHAPS = \text{Clearing House Automated Payments System transactions}$, $ELECLEAR = \text{BACS, Banks Automated Clearing System, clearings}$.

We modify Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal's definition of personal sector transactions by adding electronic clearing ($ELECLEAR$), so that:

$$CTBC = TBCLEAR - TOWNCL - CHAPS + ELECLEAR \quad (5.6)$$

where $CTBC = \text{current transactions (bank clearings)}$.

In addition, we introduce financial sector transactions, measured as:

$$FTBC = TOWNCL + CHAPS \quad (5.7)$$

so that total transactions based on bank clearing data becomes:

$$TTBC = CTBC + FTBC \quad (5.8)$$

where $TTBC = \text{total transactions (bank clearings)}$, $FTBC = \text{financial transactions (bank clearings)}$. As Howells and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal (1992) point out, bank clearings are not a perfect measure of transactions, because by definition they exclude all those transactions which are carried out with currency, which probably were still very important at the beginning of our sample period at the end of the nineteenth century. Therefore, the measure used is likely to be an understatement of the true value of transactions. However, if one assumes that since the Second World War the currency element has declined as individuals acquired clearing accounts, then the clearing bank transactions measure has become nearer to the true
total of transactions in recent years.

5.5 Comparison of Numerator Measures - Income versus Transactions

In figure 5.1 we plot, using a log scale, the three definitions of the velocity numerator (total transactions) used in this thesis. These are Net National Product (NNP), Total Transactions (Cramer definition) (TT), and Total Transactions (TIBC).

![Figure 5.1](image)

Both transactions measures are larger than Net National Product. This is to be expected, given that they measure total transactions between all sectors of the economy, whereas NNP measures only the value added by each economic agent. While the Cramer transactions definition follows the net national income measure in shape fairly closely until the 1980s, the Bank Clearing Transactions measure does not. It is due to the fact that TIBC measures not only transactions, but also the growth of
bank clearing accounts of the personal sector during the century, and is the main contributing factor for its upward trend. Given this problem, the bank clearing definition will not be used in this thesis.

5.6 Velocity - The Denominator

In theory the denominator of the velocity of circulation is the money stock. However, an initial and key question, is what constitutes the money stock. There are perhaps four theoretical approaches to defining money. The conventional one, (Lathane, 1954), where money is defined as an asset that is generally acceptable as a means of exchange and a store of value. This view considers money to be the currency in circulation and demand deposits, that is current accounts. The Chicago approach, Friedman (1956), defines money more broadly as a temporary abode of purchasing power. This view also includes time deposits with a commercial bank which are interest bearing, as it is relatively easy to withdraw money from such accounts with few financial penalties. The third approach originates from Gurley and Shaw (1960), who argue that money can be seen to include a whole family of assets which are considered by the public as a liquid store of value. Finally, there is the central bank approach to the definition of money, where money is seen in the broadest possible terms, indeed a measure of total credit available.

The various approaches to the definition of money, are reflected in the various statistical money measures available in the United Kingdom, as shown in Table 5.1.
Official Definitions of Money Stock in the United Kingdom
(1994 Definitions)

Definition of M0
Notes and coin in circulation outside the Bank of England and Bankers' operational balances with the Bank of England

Definition of M2
Holdings of:
   a. sterling notes and coin, and
   b. "retail" sterling deposits with U.K. banks and building societies

by the M4 private sector, i.e. by the U.K. private sector other than banks and building societies

Definition of M4
M4 private sector holdings of:
   a. sterling notes and coin, and
   b. all types of sterling deposits with U.K. banks and building societies (including certificates of deposit etc)


Given the proliferation of different aggregates, the concept of money becomes rather elusive. As Weintraub (1981) suggests: "Under the zeal for numerical magnitudes we have been bombarded with different aggregates, each containing a more inclusive
assortment of liquid assets, such as M1, M2, M3, ..., Mn, in bewildering profusion ... The numbering spiel can under Socratic logic, ultimately prove that "money" is something in the eye of the beholder as an economic version of beauty."

(Weintraub (1981) p.469)

One consequence of this ongoing redefinition of money, is the lack of comprehensive data over long time periods. Indeed Pepper (1992a and 1992b) believes that much of the data we do have for the post war period is inaccurate and unreliable. He suggests that there has been a massive distortion to the financial system, in particular large volumes of artificial transactions to circumvent the control mechanisms of Competition and Credit Control¹. Pepper (1992b) suggests that his work:

" ... provides a warning to time series analysts and econometricians who are attempting to analyse data with little or no knowledge of the special factors which may be present and who as a result, draw erroneous conclusions."

(Pepper (1992b) p.1)

However, while we take note of his argument, we have no alternative but to accept the available data, although we heed his words of warning.

Given the problems of measurement and the continuous redefinitions even within monetary groups (eg. M3), this study concentrates on the broad monetary aggregate M3 as defined by
Capié and Webber (1985), together with their narrow definition of M1 where appropriate. Using Capié and Webber's work as a base, gives us what we believe is a fairly reliable measure of the money stock from 1870-1991. Therefore, our two main monetary aggregates are defined as follows:

**Capie and Webber M1**

\[ CWM_1 = PC + DD \]  
(5.9)

**Capie and Webber M3**

\[ CWM_3 = PC + DD + TD + OD \]  
(5.10)

where \( PC \) = currency in the hands of the public, \( DD \) = demand deposits net of 60% of items in transit, \( TD \) = time deposits net of interbank deposits, \( OD \) = other deposits at the Bank of England.

As a contrast to these long run series we will also use current Central Statistical Office (CSO) definitions of the money stock. These are available on an annual basis from 1963 onwards, apart from money stock sterling M3 which is not published after 1989. These are defined as follows:

**CSO Money Stock M1**

\[ M_{1CSO} = NCCWP + SDNI + SDIB \]  
(5.11)

**CSO Money Stock M3**

\[ M_{3CSO} = M_{1CSO} + PSSTD \]  
(5.12)

**CSO Money Stock M4**

\[ M_{4CSO} = M_{3CSO} + PSDBS - BSHM3 \]  
(5.13)

**CSO Money Stock M5**

\[ M_{5CSO} = M_{4CSO} + OMIXBS + NSDS \]  
(5.14)

where \( NCCWP \) = notes and coin in circulation with the public, \( SDNI \)
= U.K. private sector sterling sight deposits with monetary sector (non-interest bearing adjusted for transit items), SDIB
= U.K. private sector sterling sight deposits with monetary sector (interest bearing), PSSITD = U.K. private sector time deposits, PSSDBS = private sector shares and deposits with building societies, BSHM3 = building societies holdings of M3, CMIXBS = other money market instruments excluding holdings by banks and building societies, NSDS = National Savings deposits and securities.

However, the official monetary aggregates have been criticised for the weighting scheme used to aggregate individual assets used to construct a money measure, and for the specific assets used to construct an aggregate (Barnett, 1980). This has become an ever more important issue with the rapid financial innovations which have been taking place during the last decade (Goodhart, 1986).

One way of deciding whether an asset should be included in a group for aggregation is to test for weak separability, this treats financial assets as commodities that are held for the services they provide. This approach suggests that individuals allocate assets according to their preferences for the characteristics of each asset and the relative return on each asset, which leads them to being part of a utility function. It is argued that aggregates based on weak separable groups should be more stable and should eliminate shifts in money demand functions which are a result of financial innovations. (Varian

Another criticism of the official monetary aggregates relates to potential errors associated with the simple sum weighting scheme used to derive them. This gives the same weight to currency, as money placed in deposit account where interest is received. In terms of opportunity cost these have completely different characteristics. To overcome this argument Barnett (1983, 1984) has constructed a series of divisia monetary aggregates. The advantage of this construction over simple sum aggregation, is that the measured value of the divisia index will not change, unless the utility or production functions forming the foundation of the index actually alter. These Divisia money indices are based on the difference between the rate of return on each component asset. This reflects the opportunity cost of holding a particular asset, that is the interest differential.

There is little work on Divisia monetary aggregates for the United Kingdom, the majority of the literature dealing with the United States. The most comprehensive papers for United Kingdom data are Mills (1983), Chrystal and MacDonald (1994), and Spencer (1992) upon which much of our work is based.

Following Barnett (1978) and Barnett et al. (1984), a Divisia monetary aggregate is constructed in the following manner. Let $q_i$ and $p_i$ represent the quantities and user costs of each asset to be included in the aggregate at time $t$. The expenditure share
(s_{it}) on the services of monetary asset i in the period t is:

\[ s_{it} = \frac{p_{it} q_{it}}{\sum p_{it} q_{it}} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \]  

(5.15)

The user cost (p_{it}) of each asset is measured as:

\[ p_{it} = p^{*}(R_t - r_{it}) (1-M) / (1+R_t (1-M)) \]  

(5.16)

where \( p^{*} \) is the geometric mean of the GDP deflator, \( R_t \) is the maximum available expected holding period yield (RM AX), that is the maximum rate of return available across the monetary components included, \( r_{it} \) is the observed rate of return on asset \( i \), \( M \) is the average marginal tax rate. However as Ishida (1984) points out, all terms other than \( (R_t - r_{it}) \) are common for all \( i \) and can be eliminated from the numerators and denominators which are used to compute the Divisia indices. Therefore in computing such indices, it is sufficient to use \( (R_t - r_{it}) \) as the user cost of the \( i \)-th component of money.

The growth rate of a Divisia index is constructed as the sum of the growth rate of each asset category weighted by the average share of the two periods. This can be written as:

\[ \ln Q_t - \ln Q_{t-1} = \Sigma s_{it} (\ln q_{it} - \ln q_{it-1}) \]  

(5.17)

or

\[ \Delta Q = \Sigma s_{it} \Delta q \]  

(5.18)

where \( s_{it} = 1/2 (s_{it} + s_{it-1}) \), \( \Delta q \) = the growth rate of the individual component. In order to calculate Divisia Monetary Aggregates for the United Kingdom our first task is to consider the monetary components of each proposed monetary divisia measure and their user costs. These are laid out in table 5.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Component Description</th>
<th>Interest Rate on each asset</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Currency in hands of the public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Demand Deposits Net 60% of items in transit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Time Deposits Net of Interbank Deposits</td>
<td>Rate of Interest paid on Bank Deposits</td>
<td>RBDEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Other Deposits at the Bank of England</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCWP</td>
<td>Notes and coin in circulation with the public</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDNI</td>
<td>U.K. private sector sterling sight deposits with monetary sector (non-interest bearing, adjusted for transit items)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDIB</td>
<td>U.K. private sector sterling sight deposits with monetary sector (interest bearing)</td>
<td>London interbank 7 day deposit rate</td>
<td>RINTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSTD</td>
<td>U.K. private sector time deposits</td>
<td>Rate of Interest paid on Bank Deposits</td>
<td>RBDEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSDBS</td>
<td>Private sector shares and deposits with building societies</td>
<td>Average Rate of Interest for building societies (RBDEP+RBSSH) /2</td>
<td>RBSAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>Component Description</td>
<td>Interest Rate on each asset</td>
<td>Variable Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSHM3</td>
<td>Building Societies holding of M3</td>
<td>London interbank 7 day deposit rate</td>
<td>RINTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMIXBS</td>
<td>Other money market instruments excluding holdings by banks and building societies</td>
<td>London interbank 7 day deposit rate</td>
<td>RINTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bank Bills, Treasury Bills etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDS</td>
<td>National Savings deposits and securities</td>
<td>Rate of Interest National Savings Investment Account</td>
<td>RNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMAX</td>
<td>The maximum available interest rate available at time t. (Maximum of above rates)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RMAX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7 Velocity Measurement - Empirical Evidence

In figure 5.2 we plot the three varieties of M3 income velocity, for Total Final Expenditure (V8), Personal Disposable Income (V9), and Gross Domestic Product (Factor Cost) (Average Measure) (V10). All three velocity measures follow a similar pattern for annual data 1870-1991, their magnitudes reflecting the various definitions.

![Three Varieties of M3 Income Velocity](image)

Figure 5.2

Given its widespread use in empirical work, we concentrate analysis on velocity as defined as Net National Product/Capie and Webber M3, (V1), as shown in figure 5.3.
In the period 1870-1913 velocity (V_t) is quite stable, with random fluctuations around a constant mean. It has been suggested by de Cecco (1974) and Brown (1940), that during this period Britain was an open economy at the apex of a world wide political empire. This meant that the Bank of England could manage the Gold Standard using small changes in interest rates to maintain monetary stability. After the First World War velocity growth fell in line with the sharp deflation. After a partial recovery during the 1920s, it fell again during the recession of the early 1930s. During the Second World War it fell to a new low, the war years being characterised by growing liquidity and various limits on private expenditure and other controls. There was a decline in the production of consumer goods during this period and a strong propensity to save in order to finance the war effort.
When the war ended in 1945 the high levels of liquidity were converted into consumer spending, and this probably contributed to a strong rise in the growth of velocity. To Morrell (1987) the stability of the money supply between 1946 and 1964 was due to the application of direct controls over banks. During this period the banks' loan portfolios were around 45% of their assets. Therefore to Morrell (1987):

"... since every advance creates its own deposit, the expansion of bank credit and the money supply was held at a relatively modest rate, averaging 4 per cent per annum between 1946 and 1964. With output (GDP) growing at around 2.5 per cent in real terms, price inflation would have averaged no more than 1.5% (the element of surplus money) but for the acceleration in the velocity of money, which contributed to an average inflation rate of 3%."  

(Morrell (1987) p.30)

However, from the early 1970s direct controls over the banking system began to be dismantled. Within this more free market environment bank loans as a ratio of total money supply began to increase rapidly. Furthermore during Barber's 1972-1973 "dash for growth" monetary policy became very loose, and with increased consumer spending to beat the introduction of value-added tax in 1973, it led to the money supply rising rapidly, leading to a decline in income velocity growth measures using broad measures of money. After the world economic crisis in 1974/75, monetary policy was on the whole restrictive, interest rates rose, and velocity of circulation also rose to a peak in 1980. In the period 1980-1991, when for the most part inflation was falling,
monetary policy was restrictive, and all measures of income velocity M3 fell uniformly.

As we discussed earlier, the Cramer transactions velocity M3 displays similar characteristics to the income velocity M3, albeit at a higher magnitude. The exception being the additional peak in 1988, and subsequent decline. Total Transactions Velocity (V2) is illustrated in figure 5.4.
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Figure 5.4

The interesting point about transactions velocity is that it can be split into its three component parts, current transactions velocity (V4), transfers transactions velocity (V5), and asset and portfolio transactions velocity (V26), as shown in figure 5.5. V4 shows similar characteristics to income velocity (V1). However, transfers transactions velocity (V5) displays different characteristics. It rises almost continuously from 0.19276 in
1875 to a peak of 2.6413 in 1979 before falling in line with most velocity measures. The exception is the notable trough in 1972, and relatively level periods between 1883 and 1902, together with 1918 and 1934. Asset and portfolio adjustment transactions (V26) also has unique characteristics, it moves around a fairly constant mean from 1870 to 1939. During the Second World War it falls to an all time low of 1.0707. In post war Britain, there is an upward trend, with notable peaks in 1971, 1976, and 1988, and troughs in 1973/4 and 1983.
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**Figure 5.5**

The velocity measures using Divisia M3 data are very similar to their simple sum M3 counterparts until the early 1970's. As an example figure 5.6 shows velocity V1, that is Net National Product (NNP) divided by Capie and Webber M3, together with V14, Net National Product (NNP) divided by Divisia Capie and Webber M3.
The most significant differences between the simple sum velocities and divisia velocities take place between 1963 and 1991. Figure 5.7 illustrates V1, its divisia counterpart V14, and the equivalent velocity measure using Divisia M4, V18, for the period 1963 to 1991. Between 1963 and 1973 V14 is larger than V1. The years 1974 to 1978 are characterised by V14 being smaller than V1. Divisia M3 velocity peaks in 1980 unlike its simple sum counterpart. After 1980 V14 converges with V1. The Divisia M5 velocity measure, V18, declines until 1974, unlike V1 which peaks in 1969 and then declines. The shape of the V18 is then similar to V1, although its magnitude is smaller, which is to be expected, although the shape of the curve is less pronounced.
Total Transactions Velocity (Cramer Definition), V2, together with its Divisia Capie and Webber M3, V15, and Divisia M4, V21, counterparts are illustrated in figure 5.8. The first ten years finds V15 being larger than V2. However, after the trough of 1973, V2 becomes larger for the next four years. There is a common peak in 1977, but V15 peaks again in 1980. Between 1981 and 1986 both velocity measures are fairly constant, they both peak in 1987 before declining in the early 1990's. Apart from the declining in the 1960's, V21 follows a similar path to V2, albeit at a lower magnitude.
In this section we have discussed a number of ways that velocity of circulation of money can be measured. Nevertheless how well these statistical definitions capture true velocity is difficult to ascertain, especially as the evolution of money continues at a rapid pace, and the difficulties posed by accurately recording the number of transactions taking place in the economy. However, these are far too numerous to be of use in our empirical work. Given the small number of observations available for divisia velocity measures these were not considered further. The empirical work concentrates on income velocity (V1) and transactions velocity (V2). The development of the long term model being the first step.
Chapter 6

The Volume of Transactions in the United Kingdom

6.1 Introduction

Early literature concerning the velocity of circulation used the volume of transactions as the measurement of the value of goods and services. However, difficulties in measuring transactions and the advent of national income accounting led to the former being dismissed in favour of the latter, on grounds of lack of reliable statistical data. Nevertheless, this substitution can only be considered satisfactory if there is a strong correlation between the behaviour of the two series. The last chapter discussed a number of ways of measuring the volume of transactions. This established the Cramer (1981a) method as the favoured alternative. This chapter discusses in some detail the framework used to construct a volume of transactions variable for the United Kingdom covering the period 1870-1991. It also describes the problems associated with collecting transactions data. With the data at hand, the various components of transactions are considered. Finally, the relationship between income and transactions is examined.

6.2 Background

Before the advent of comprehensive national income accounting, there were a number of attempts at measuring the volume of transactions in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. An early study by des Essars (1895) attempted to construct transactions velocities for a number of countries. Fisher (1911, 1919) wrote comprehensively about the subject in the context of the United
States. This work was extended by Snyder (1934) and Angell (1936) who believed that transactions velocity was an important indicator of business conditions. Contemporaneously Edie and Weaver (1930) and Keynes (1930) estimated the number of transactions for England. The middle years of this century saw little interest in measuring transactions. The exceptions being Garvy and Blyn (1970), Turvey (1960) and Lieberman (1977). A revival took place in the early nineteen eighties with Cramer (1981a) who constructed the volume of transactions for the United Kingdom for the period 1968 to 1977. This was complemented by similar studies for the Netherlands 1950-1978, Cramer (1981b) and the United States 1950-1979, Cramer (1986). This framework of analysis being constructed by extending similar work by Jonker (1973). It is this methodology which is used here to build a volume of transactions variable for the United Kingdom 1870-1991.

6.3 Framework of Analysis

The initial starting point is a variation on the equation of exchange;

\[ MV = \sum P_i T_j \]  

(6.1)

where \( M \) = money, \( V \) = the velocity of circulation, \( P \) = the price level and \( T \) is the volume of transactions. Cramer (1981a) abandons the distinction between price and volume and estimates each \( P_i T_j \) as the money value at current prices of each category of transactions. The identity of the equation of exchange holds only if all payments on the left hand side are accounted for by transactions on the right hand side. The main aim of this work is the encapsulation of the latter.
It is important to note, that as with previous work in this area, all transactions data is rough and an approximation. As Cramer (1981a) points out, in view of the fact that government statistical data is not constructed for this purpose, at best it provides an estimate of the order of magnitude of the variables concerned. Indeed, Cramer (1981a) states;

"In the case of PT we have laboriously been trying to undo the work of the compilers of macro-economic statistics who net out opposing flows and reduce gross output or turnover to its value added component. Inevitably the precision of our procedures is no match for theirs. While it would be tedious to repeat these reservations throughout the text they should be borne in mind constantly."

Cramer (1981a, p.235-236)

Therefore where it is possible to measure a certain group of transactions, this often involves a great amount of extrapolation and interpolation. Thus estimates for successive years are not necessarily independent. Nevertheless, constructing transactions has the benefit of identifying different types of transactions, which do not necessarily move together.

In order to measure the volume of transactions in the United Kingdom, it is necessary to identify the different types of transaction and the different groups of economic agents who interact with each other. If we recall from chapter five, Cramer (1981a) separates PT into three components, current transactions (CT), transfer transactions (TF), and asset and portfolio
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adjustment transactions (APA). So that total transactions (TT) is defined as:

\[ TT = CT + TF + APA \]  

(6.2)

It is also possible to group economic agents into six categories, Producing Firms (i.e. firms involved in primary and secondary industries, together with agriculture), Wholesale, Retail and Service Firms, the Financial Sector, Government, Rest of the World, and Households. In order to understand these interactions and to justify why the data presented here represents a full account of transactions, each type of transaction will be dealt with in turn.

6.4 Current Transactions

First let us consider those current transactions in connection with production. Firms involved in the secondary sector purchase raw materials from the primary sector (or from overseas), input labour and capital to produce goods, pay wages, and profits to shareholders. That is income to households. The goods are sold to wholesalers and retailers, who add their margins and also pay wages and dividends. Finally, the retail sector sell the goods to households, and pay indirect taxes to the Government. A similar process takes place for the agricultural sector. In both cases some produce/goods are exported and others imported. The service sector also interacts with households and other firms. The Government is also a player, purchasing goods and services, and providing subsidies in certain cases. Consequently current transactions can be measured as:
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\[ CT = OP + AGOP + PCON + IN + PAPG \]  
(6.3)

where \( OP \) = industrial output, \( AGOP \) = agriculture output, \( PCON \) = expenditure on final goods and services (personal consumption), \( IN \) = incomes (from employment, self employment, profit, rent), \( PAPG \) = public sector payments for goods and services.

Industrial output includes exports but imports are not recorded. This would not be a problem if all exports were paid for in domestic currency and all imports in foreign currency. Unfortunately, Cramer (1981a) found that proportions vary, and was unable to take this into account. Ideally industrial output should be derived from input/output tables. However, the publication dates of these are not consistent and do not include the whole sample period. Observations of industrial output for the period 1870-1906 are taken from Hoffman (1955). Whereas Lomax (1959) is used for data collection in the middle part of this century. The post war period consults the Census of Production, with intervening years derived through interpolation. One problem with this method is ever changing industry definitions. Industrial output in constant prices is illustrated in figure 6.1. In 1850 the British Economy was very much reliant on agriculture and textiles. However, in the twenty years leading up to the start of the sample period, Britain became industrialised with major growth taking place in engineering, ship building, mines and quarries. The major source of this increase in demand was overseas purchases of ships and railways, which in turn led to a greater requirement for iron, steel and coal. However, towards the end of the nineteenth century there
was increasing industrial competition from Germany, France and America. This meant that Britain lost much of its earlier supremacy. An additional problem was the adoption of trade barriers in Europe, which led not only to the loss of trade, but also allowed indigenous industries to build up behind their protection. At the turn of the century industry began to recover, but this was due to one industry, coal. However, this large increase masked the stagnation in the textile industry and the development of the American and German iron and steel industries which hit British exports. The industrial malaise which emerged after the end of the first world war had its roots before 1914, and it was not only a British problem. There were perhaps two main roots. First, the long term trend towards low prices of primary products, made it more difficult for nations producing these commodities to afford to import manufactured goods. Second, the war had caused major dislocation of characteristic nineteenth century trade patterns. There were also the new industrial powers of Japan and the United States, and the virtual withdrawal of Russia from world markets. It was with this already poor situation that the Great Depression shattered the world's economy between 1929 and 1932. Nevertheless by 1935 industrial recovery had started, mainly due to the growth of the new industries, including chemicals, rayon, cars and radio. However, the largest factor in this recovery was the building boom in both the private and industrial sectors. This situation came to an abrupt halt in September 1939 at the start of the second world war. There was a post war boom in industry and in building, caused by war time lags and shortages. This was also helped by the emerging new
products such as man-made fibres and plastics which developed rapidly. Nevertheless, industrial output peaked in 1966 and has declined, for the most part, ever since. Nevertheless, the statistics are distorted by the discovery of North Sea oil in the mid 1970s. Furthermore, the fall in industrial output in the early 1980s can be attributed to the closure of much of the traditional primary industries such as coal and steel.

Agricultural output is taken from a variety of sources. Prior to the First World War data is recorded in Bellerby (1968), who writes comprehensively about agrarian history in the nineteenth century. Ojala (1952) provides a number of observations for the period 1915-1944, and interpolation is used to establish intervening years. Remaining values of AGOP are taken from various Annual Abstract of Statistics. Agricultural output, as illustrated in figure 6.2, declined at the end of the nineteenth
century. There were bad harvests in the late 1870s and a greater reliance on imported food supplies. Furthermore, competition in wheat production from overseas, especially from Argentina, Canada, and the U.S.A. grew quickly at this time, helped by the development of steamships and railways. Another problem was the movement of labour to the towns which was depopulating the countryside. Between 1881 and 1901 the number of farm labourers fell from 983,919 to 689,292. Agricultural output recovered in the early part of this century, mainly in the form of the dairy trade. This was fairly immune to foreign competition and enjoyed rising demand from the increasing urban population. During the first world war the German government intensified submarine warfare which hindered the import of food from abroad. To overcome this problem the British government chose to produce as much food at home as possible, bringing back into cultivation much of the land lost to grass in the 1870s. This accounts for the rise in domestic production for 1917/1918. A brief recovery ensued after 1918, before the major slump of the 1930s. The early part of the second world war saw much reliance on indigenous food supplies and agrarian output rose steeply. The same policy was adopted as in the first world war, although in 1939 the new measures were adopted much more quickly and greater effort was made in giving farmers essential machinery and labour. By 1945 overall tillage in Britain was 55% greater than the average for the years 1935-1939. The post-1945 period has been one of great change both technically and organizationally. Furthermore, while agriculture was largely unprotected from foreign competition before the second world war, it has enjoyed heavy subsidies.
thereafter. Indeed, when Britain joined the E.E.C. in 1973 the level of subsidies increased still further. Protected by these subsidies farmers have invested heavily in machinery, drainage, and buildings. There has also been greater economies of scale by the amalgamation of farms.

Expenditure on final goods and services represents the final transactions between retail/service firms and households. However, there is an omission, that is transactions between wholesalers and retailers, where statistical data before the second world war was not available. Cramer (1981a) suggests a fixed mark up of industrial output. But there must be some doubt as to the accuracy of such a measure. On the one hand industrial output includes exports which do not enter the domestic distribution system and on the other, wholesalers sell imported goods which are not included in domestic industrial production.
Furthermore, some producing firms sell direct to large retailers, and the mark up may vary over time and between industrial sectors. For these reasons the estimate of current transactions must be always be lower than its true value. With the exception of the two world wars, expenditure on final goods and services, figure 6.3, has risen almost continuously over the sample period.

![Expenditure on Final Goods and Services - Constant Prices](image)

**Figure 6.3**

Income must include that from employment, self employment, profits of companies and public corporations, together with rent. To avoid the double counting of transactions, income tax and national insurance contributions deducted at source must be excluded. In consequence it is possible to define income as:

\[
IN = INEMP + INSEMP - TAXI + PROFITCO + SURPCO + SURPENT + RENT
\]

(6.4)

where \(INEMP = \) income from employment, \(INSEMP = \) income from self
employment, TAXI = taxes on personal income, PROFITCO = gross trading profits of companies, SURPCO = gross trading surplus of public corporations, SURPENT = gross trading surplus of other public enterprises, RENT = rents. Excellent data sources are available for all income variables. Feinstein (1972) provides most of the required statistics, supplemented by Mitchell and Deane (1962) where necessary. Incomes measured in constant prices are shown graphically in figure 6.4. The growth rate of incomes was fairly low in the latter years of the nineteenth century and early years of this century. Between the wars, the economy was for the most part in a state of considerable depression and incomes fell. However, by 1934 incomes were growing quickly as the economy came out of the Great Depression. After the second world war incomes rose more rapidly around a fairly constant upward trend. Of course, there were variations, most notably the Barber Boom, the decline in incomes during the oil crisis of the mid 1970s and the depression of the early 1980s.
The payment for public sector goods and services (PAPG) includes the public sectors contribution to production/output. Following Cramer (1981a) it consists of final consumption, gross domestic capital formation and stockbuilding by both central and local Government. It is defined algebraically as:

\[ PAPG = GFC + GCF \]  

where \( GFC = \) government final consumption, \( GCF = \) government capital formation. However, the correct classification of payments for public goods and services in our framework of analysis is somewhat in doubt. Cramer (1981a) argues that on the one hand the services that the general public receive are not directly paid for, and as such do not give rise to transactions. On the other hand, it is possible to argue that this output has a counterpart in the form of Government revenue, either through taxation or charges, and that such payments are linked with
current transactions. The latter view is adopted here.

The payment for public goods and services is dominated by the two peaks caused by the world wars, as illustrated in figure 6.5. But these mask, to some extent, the changes which have taken place in the number of government transactions. Views on the role of the state in the economy changed considerably over the sample period. Adam Smith (1776) defined three roles for government. First, the external defence of the country. Second, to ensure that law and order were maintained in that country. Last, the erection and maintenance of certain works and other public institutions where an individual or company would not obtain a reasonable profit, but which were important to society as a whole. In consequence, the latter half of the nineteenth century saw a policy of laissez-faire. Where market forces were left to determine production and consumption patterns, and the government played a very limited role. However, in the early twentieth century there was a greater awareness of the issues of public health, education, poverty, and unemployment, and that it was appropriate for state intervention and provision. This decline in the views of economic individualism and the rise in socialist ideas led to the liberal welfare reforms before the first world war. The inter-war years can be seen as a period of transition. While the role of the state had greatly increased since the turn of the century, many Victorian values remained. It was the influence of the new economics of Keynes after the second world war, which was to lead to the transformation of fiscal policy. This led to demand management of the economy in an attempt to
avoid major booms and slumps and maintain full employment, the adoption of universal welfare benefits, and the nationalization of major industries. These changes led in turn to a rapid increase in the governments transactions in the economy. During the 1970s the size of public expenditure became a major political issue. First, the 1974-1979 Labour Government made efforts to curb the growth of government expenditure after pressure from the International Monetary Fund. Second, a Conservative Government was elected which sought to give priority to controlling public expenditure in order to reduce the burden of taxation. While government expenditure on goods and services has continued to rise, government capital formation has fallen since 1976.

Figure 6.5
6.5 Transfer Transactions

The second category of transactions are transfer payments. These can be divided into three groups. First, transfers between households and the financial sector. These include insurance premiums and payments, life assurance, and benevolent funds. Second, the transfer of funds between the State and other economic agents. These include taxation, national insurance contributions, grants, subsidies and social security payments. Last, transfers between central and local government. Transfers within households are not included, because it is argued that households cannot trade with themselves. In consequence transfers can be defined as:

\[ TF = TFPS + TFGS + TFCLG \] (6.6)

where TFPS = transfers of the private sector, TFGS = transfers of the government sector (including inter-governmental transfers), TFCLG = transfers - central to local government.

Income transfers of the private sector consist of insurance premiums together with pensions and benefits deriving from superannuation or life insurance. Turnover of collecting societies and friendly societies are also included in the total. Consequently transfers of the private sector can be written as:

\[ TFPS = LABIN + LABOUT + LAINDIN + LAINDOUT + IPOL + TOCS + OGCS + TOFS + BPFS \] (6.7)

where LABIN = life assurance business (ordinary business) - Income, LABOUT = life assurance business (ordinary business) - outgoings, LAINDIN = life assurance business (industrial business) - income, IPOL = insurance premiums and outgoings -
other than life, TOCS = turnover collecting societies, OGCS = outgoings collecting societies, TOFS = turnover friendly societies, BPFS = benefits paid friendly societies.

The Life Assurance Acts of 1867, 1870, and 1872 set up the regulatory framework for this sector of insurance companies' business. It is from the resulting parliamentary papers that much of the early data is found. While insurance premiums and outgoings other than life appear as a total in IPOL, they are in fact derived from several categories, accident, employers liability, fire, marine, motor vehicle and miscellaneous. Sheppard (1971) provides an excellent source for insurance premiums, but data for outgoings are less reliable, using insurance industry sources. The Friendly Society Acts between 1793 and 1855 set up the legislative framework in which these charitable or non-profit organizations were to operate. The resulting parliamentary reports are the source for much of the corresponding data, although nineteenth century observations were difficult to obtain. Collecting Societies activities peak in 1968 and decline until 1980, when a resurgence takes place. While Friendly Societies transactions peak in 1935 before falling to new low levels in the 1950s and 1960s. Greater activity takes place after 1976.

Transfers of the private sector, figure 6.6, show modest growth until the second world war and more rapid growth thereafter. However, there is a fall in transfers in the mid 1970s, brought about by a sudden fall in the area of life assurance business.
Transfers of the public sector cover receipts and expenditure of both central and local Government. They can be defined as:

\[ \text{TPGS} = \text{TPGEXP} + \text{TFGR} \]  

(6.8)

where \( \text{TPGEXP} = \text{transfers} - \text{Government expenditure} \), \( \text{TFGR} = \text{transfers} - \text{Government receipts} \). During the sample period, as we have already discussed in some depth, the Government played an increasingly significant role in shaping the development of transfers. In particular, changes in government policy in the social and fiscal field had a large impact. The Old Age Pension Acts following 1908, the National Health Insurance Act and the Unemployment Income Act of 1911, the Blind Act of 1920, the War Pensions Scheme Act of 1915, and the Old Age Contributing Pension Act of 1925 all increased the level of Government transfers. However, the biggest impact was the establishment of the Welfare
State after the Second World War. In the latter part of the sample period higher unemployment and a growing elderly population has increased transfer payments still further.

Transfers of the government sector, figure 6.7, are small until 1914, when they grow more rapidly. The new level is maintained until 1939 when government transfers rise once again. The 1950s are characterised by a period of constancy. After this point, with minor exceptions, they increase more rapidly, until the late 1980s. It is interesting to note the Displacement Effect identified by Peacock and Wiseman (1961) in a study of trends in public expenditure 1890 to 1955. This suggested that government expenditure grew very much in line with national income during peacetime. While in the wars public spending rose substantially, but this was never reversed at the cessation of hostilities. The ratchet effect can be seen clearly in figure 6.7. What is particularly important to transfers, is the fact that the ratchet effect is much less marked if government consumption is excluded. This the authors suggest is due to a greater acceptance of redistribution after the sacrifice of wartime.
Transfers from central to local government behave much the same as other government transfer statistics until 1974 when they fall suddenly due to the fiscal policy changes discussed above. These transfers regain their previous level in the early 1980s before falling again. Growth is restored once more at the end of the sample. (see figure 6.8). It is unclear whether transfers from central to local Government involve monetary payments or are just accounting entries by Government institutions or entries in its accounts at the Bank of England. Nevertheless, if the equation of exchange is to be maintained, these transactions must be included.
The third category identified by Cramer (1981a) is asset and portfolio adjustment. This includes capital investment by firms, the movement of funds in and out of financial institutions, advances and repayments of house mortgages and the turnover of ordinary shares and gilts. Unfortunately, as with earlier work in this field, there are omissions due to lack of comprehensive data. These include direct borrowing by industry from financial institutions, transactions in antiques, second hand cars, used machinery and plant, and the cash component of company mergers and acquisitions. So asset and portfolio adjustment transactions are always understated. It is also important to note that for the equation of exchange identity to hold, all payments in money must be exchanged for something else, for example goods, services,
claims, fiscal obligations, shares. Therefore exchange of money for money, for instance drawing cash from an individual's bank account or transfers of funds between two accounts held by the same person, must be excluded. By the same token, barter, where no money changes hands must also not be counted. Asset and Portfolio adjustment can be defined as:

\[ \text{APA} = \text{PCF} + \text{PORTA} \]  

(6.9)

where PCF = private sector capital formation, PORTA = private sector portfolio adjustment.

Private sector capital formation, that is business investment in plant and machinery and house building, is shown in figure 6.9, it is cyclical around a constant mean until 1938. There is a break in the series between 1939 and 1945. The final years, for the most part, follow an upward trend until 1988, when a decline takes place.
Private sector portfolio adjustment covers the gross movement of funds in and out of Building Societies, National Savings, Unit Trusts, together with mortgage advances and repayments, and an estimate of the turnover of securities, both ordinary shares and government gilts. The corresponding sub total is:

\[
\text{PORTA} = \text{BSDEP} + \text{BSWITH} + \text{BSDEPREC} + \text{BSDEPWITH} + \text{NSDEP} + \text{NSWITH} + \text{UTDEP} + \text{UTWITH} + \text{BSAD} + \text{MORTR} + \text{MORTI} + \text{TOSECRORD} + \text{TOSECRGIL} \tag{6.10}
\]

where \( \text{BSDEP} \) = Building Society shares subscribed (deposits), \( \text{BSWITH} \) = Building Society shares withdrawn (including interest), \( \text{BSDEPREC} \) = Building Society deposits received, \( \text{BSDEPWITH} \) = Building Society deposits withdrawn (including interest), \( \text{NSDEP} \) = National Savings Deposits, \( \text{NSWITH} \) = National Savings withdrawals, \( \text{UTDEP} \) = Unit Trust deposits, \( \text{UTWITH} \) = Unit Trust withdrawals, \( \text{BSAD} \) = mortgage Advances (Building Societies), \( \text{MORTR} \)
Mortgage repayments of principal, \( M\text{ORTI} \) = mortgage interest, \\
\( \text{TOSECRORD} \) = turnover securities (ordinary shares), \\
\( \text{TOSECRGIL} \) = turnover securities (government gilts).

There is some doubt as to whether these financial transactions constitute demand for money or if they are just the placement of temporary idle balances. Indeed, many involve banks, and the money they use in completing their business may not be part of the money supply. Furthermore, many of these transactions take place in a restricted and very well organized market place with special payment techniques. As Keynes (1930, p.41) and Garvy and Blyn (1970, p.46) point out, such technology allows a large turnover on relatively small balances. This leads to the transactions velocity of circulation being much larger than in other cases.

Private sector portfolio adjustment shows little variation until 1963, as shown in figure 6.10. There was cyclical behaviour around a slight upward trend for the next twenty years. However, major structural changes took place in the financial markets during the 1980s. Traditionally the Building Societies had collected savings from members and provided mortgages to owner occupiers. The Building Society Act of 1986 broadened the range of financial services that they were allowed to undertake. This led to increased activity in estate agency, insurance broking, fund management and financial advice. The booming housing market of the late 1980s acted as a catalyst to these changes and this led to rapid growth. There were also large reforms on the London
Stock and Securities markets during this period. These were introduced on Monday 27th October 1986, known commonly as "Big Bang". These changes embraced advancements in computer technology, and led to large new market makers being created, usually by merging broking and jobbing firms and sometimes with banks. Many overseas banks and finance houses also saw this as a unique opportunity to enter the London security markets. The new arrangements attracted new capital into the market, and there was a large increase in turnover, especially foreign securities, in what was already a rising market. However, in October 1987 share prices and turnover fell dramatically. The renaissance of the Building Societies and the financial markets led to all but one of the components of PORTAR to behave in a similar manner, that is growing very quickly until 1987 and then falling spectacularly. The one exception is National Savings. These peak in 1973 and then fall quickly before settling at a fairly constant level. It is also of interest to note the peaks in National Savings deposits during the two world wars.

This completes the framework used to construct total transactions and its three component, current transactions, transfers, and asset and portfolio adjustment. With the model at hand it is possible to consider the empirical evidence for the United Kingdom for the period 1870-1991 as a whole.
The total transactions variable generated by the framework outlined above is shown in terms of constant prices in figure 6.11. This graph by itself is not very informative. Illustrating that, for the most part, total transactions in real terms have risen throughout the sample period until latter years. There is a moderate trend until the Second World War, followed by a more pronounced one during the 1960s and 1970s, and a very steep upward trend in the 1980s. The major exception to the rule is the period of depression in the mid 1920s.
Of more interest are the ratios of the various categories of transactions to all transactions. Current transactions as a ratio to total transactions is illustrated in figure 6.12. In 1870, 76% of total transactions were accounted for by current transactions. This fluctuated around a constant mean until the turn of the century when it fell to approximately 60%. At this point, with the exception of the First World War, it remained until hostilities broke out against Nazi Germany in 1939, when the ratio rose steeply. The 1950s and early 1960s saw a gradual decline in current transactions associated with production compared with transfers, and asset and portfolio adjustment components. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the ratio stabilized around a value of approximately 58%. However, the early 1980s saw a rapid decline to 31% in 1987, after which a slight recovery took place.
The ratio of transfer transactions to total transactions is portrayed in figure 6.13.
Transfer transactions made up only 2% of total transactions in 1870. This rose slowly during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A major increase took place at the start of the first world war, after which an upward trend was followed until the mid 1960s. This whole period corresponded with greater government intervention in the economy and the establishment of the welfare state. A notable deviation above trend being the years of the second world war. The ratio stabilized in the 1970s, before reaching a peak of 18%. The early Thatcher era saw a steep decline in transfers compared with earlier years.

The final ratio of interest is that between asset and portfolio adjustment and total transactions. This is shown in figure 6.14.
This ratio varies around a constant mean of approximately 29% between 1870 and 1939. The major exception being the Great Depression of the 1920s. There is a slow recovery after the Second World War, followed by a period of some stability. However, there is a very steep increase in the ratio during the late 1980s, followed by a moderate decline. This period corresponding with the Lawson "boom" and "bust", together with major technological changes to the financial markets in the City. Indeed, in 1987, 58% of all transactions were in the asset and portfolio adjustment category. Perhaps reinforcing Keynes (1930) concerns of whether financial transactions should be included in the total, when this is distorted so badly by their inclusion.

6.8 Is Income a good proxy for transactions?

As we discussed earlier, the transactions variable is much neglected in modern macroeconomic and monetary theory. The demand for money is customarily related to income. However, since one of the prime uses of money is a means of payment, one could argue that income is the incorrect variable to use, unless there is a strong correlation between itself and transactions. Cramer (1981b) points out, that if income is used instead of transactions in the definition of velocity, then there must be an additional assumption arising from the identity:

\[
\text{National Income} = \text{National Income} \times \frac{\text{Transactions}}{\text{Money Stock}} \times \frac{\text{Money Stock}}{\text{Transactions}} \tag{6.11}
\]

The left hand side of this equation is of course income velocity. Its movement may be caused by either of the terms on the right hand side. However, it is usual that these are attributed to the
second term. The assumption being made that the income-
transactions ratio is a constant. Nevertheless, this is not
necessarily the case. Whether or not this is true is an empirical
issue. A plot of the income-transactions ratio is illustrated in
figure 6.15.

The income-transactions ratio fluctuates around a constant mean
between 1870 and 1939. The only exception being in the early
1920s. After the second world war the ratio for the most part
begins a gentle decline. There follows a sharp rise in the mid
1970s. The behaviour of the ratio in the 1980s is characterised
by a dramatic fall when transactions rose much quicker than
income followed by a mild recovery.
More formally it is possible to test, following Cramer (1981b),
the relationship between transactions and income by estimating
the relationship:
\[ \ln T = \alpha + \beta \ln Y \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.12)
where \( T \) = total transactions (current prices) and \( Y \) = income
(current prices). Using data for the whole sample period gave the
following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinary Least Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870-1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ln T = 1.1609 + 1.0541 \ln Y )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 = 0.99843 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 122 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.W. = 0.39659 [d_4 = 1.522 d_6 = 1.562 (4-d_6) = 2.438]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{90} = 1.980 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{95} = 1.658 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F(1,119) = 209.3010 ) [3.92]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F(1,119) = 41.9021 ) [3.92]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^2(2) = 256.2962 ) [5.991]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F(1,120) = 31.9642 ) [3.92]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation coefficient between \( T \) and \( Y \) over the period 1870-
1991 is very high at 0.99843. Nevertheless, this may in part be
due to the effect of price inflation which both variables have
in common. To test for this possible problem, the equation was
examined again using transactions and national income measured
in constant prices. While the parameters differ in size, the
characteristics of the relationship are much the same, and so are
not reported. This is similar to the conclusion reached by Cramer
(1981b). The slope coefficient of equation (6.13) is
approximately one, and the constant close to \( \log (3.19) \) which is
1.1600. This result being remarkably similar to the parameter
However, the reported equation has a number of problems. The Durbin Watson statistic is smaller than the corresponding critical value $d$, which suggests positive autocorrelation. This is confirmed by the Lagrange multiplier test for serial correlation, $F(1,119) = 209.3010$ [3.92]. It also fails the test for normality $\chi^2(2) = 256.2962$ [5.991] which also puts in doubt the reliability of all the classical tests, as these are based on the assumption of normality. So although it would appear that tests for functional form ($F_1$) and heteroscedasticity ($F_2$) fail, their reliability is unclear. Furthermore, while the $R^2$ suggests a high percentage of transactions are explained by income, if one looks at the residuals, figure 6.16, there are a number of outliers.
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**Figure 6.16**

Those of most interest are 1880-1887, 1917-1920, 1978-1983 and 1986-1991. These groups also correspond with periods where
transactions and income diverged in their behaviour. Between 1879 and 1881 total transactions grew much faster than income, as illustrated in figure 6.17.

By considering a graph of the rates of growth of the three components of total transactions, figure 6.18, it is clear that much of this deviation is brought about by asset and portfolio adjustment (DSAPA). While the obvious conclusion is that this is due to high activity in financial transactions, this is probably not the case. For the early 1880s were a period when Life Assurance, Building Society and other innovative financial institutions were entering the data base for the first time, and this is a more likely scenario in explaining this distortion.
Another period of interest is that towards the end of the first world war, and immediately afterwards. Once again transactions increase more rapidly than income between 1916-1918, grows less rapidly in 1919 before matching income growth in 1920. This is shown in figure 6.19.
Closer analysis of the component parts of transactions indicates that transfers are the biggest contributor to this behaviour, as illustrated in figure 6.20. One must assume that the increase was due to the war effort and the introduction of the basic social security payments introduced by the Liberal government discussed earlier.
The final two groups of outliers, 1978-1983 and 1986-1991, can be considered together. In the first, income growth is fairly constant for the initial three years of the sub sample before declining. While there is great variation in transactions, as shown in figure 6.21. A similar situation occurs in 1986-1991, with income growing at a constant rate throughout, but with major swings in the rate of change of transactions.
Comparison of the rates of growth of the three components of total transactions, figure 6.22, shows that in both sub samples it is the deviation of asset and portfolio adjustment which causes these variations, while the growth of current transactions and transfers are relatively stable.
The large swings in asset and portfolio adjustment transactions are probably due to two factors. First, the short term influence of the "Lawson" boom and bust of the late 1980s, which in particular affected the housing market statistics. Second, the long term changes brought about by the deregulation of the financial markets and the resulting financial product innovations which took place at this time. The potential break down of the income transactions relationship is a subject we will return to in a moment.

Figure 6.22
To check parameter stability the regression was estimated recursively and the plots of the intercept and the coefficient on ln Y illustrated in figures 6.23 and 6.24.

Figure 6.23
This suggests that the parameters are very unstable in the period before the first world war, but fairly stable thereafter. One of the main reasons for the early variation may be the less reliable transactions data in the nineteenth century.

Yet we must interpret these graphs with some caution given the problem of autocorrelation. It is possible to correct for this using the Cochrane-Orcutt method, as used in equation (6.14).
Cochrane-Orcutt Method AR(2) Converged after 1 iteration

1870-1991

\[
\ln T = 1.1504 + 1.0556 \ln Y \\
\quad (12.8042) (108.4606)
\]

\[R^2 = 0.99943 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.04528\]

\[n = 122 \quad k = 1\]

D.W. = 1.9727 \[\hat{d}_1 = 1.522 \quad \hat{d}_2 = 1.562 \quad (4-d_0) = 2.438\]

\[t_{90} = 1.980 \quad t_{95} = 1.658\]

Parameters of the Autoregressive Error Specification

\[U = 0.95939 \ U_{t-1} - 0.18755 \ U_{t-2} \quad (10.4811) \quad (1.9978)\]

It is interesting to note that the parameters vary only very slightly from the original regression (6.13) when the Cochrane-Orcutt technique is applied.

One pertinent question is whether the relationship between income and transactions significantly changed in the late 1980s. A method of testing for this is to reconsider equation (6.13) for the period 1870-1979, the year that Thatcher came to power, and to use these results to forecast transactions for the following twelve years to 1991. This gave the following results:
Ordinary Least Squares

1870-1979

\[ \ln T = 1.2955 + 1.0375 \ln Y \] (6.15)

\[ \begin{align*}
R^2 &= 0.99907 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.04338 \\
n &= 110 \\
k &= 1 \\
D.W. &= 0.67809 \quad [d_0 = 1.522, d_0 = 1.562, (4-d_0) = 2.438] \\
t_{90} &= 1.980 \\
t_{59} &= 1.658 \\
F(1,119) &= 82.7538 \ [3.94] \\
F(1,119) &= 11.5333 \ [3.94] \\
x^2(2) &= 15.5015 \ [5.991] \\
F(1,120) &= 0.0060205 \ [3.92] \\
F(12,108) &= 21.0003 \ [1.85] \\
F(2,118) &= 61.1547 \ [3.09]
\end{align*} \]

Two diagnostic tests are of most interest, \( F_4 \), Chow’s second test of adequacy of predictions, and \( F_5 \), Chow’s test of the stability of the regression coefficients. Both tests fail, putting aside concerns about normality, in the case of equation (6.15), and this suggests poor predictive performance for the period 1979-1991, which is confirmed by figure 6.25. The forecast is very good up until 1985. However, after that point actual transactions exceed the forecast by a large amount. Nevertheless, a lack of future observations makes it impossible to discuss whether this is an irreconcilable break down of the income/transactions relationship or a temporary disturbance.
Nevertheless, there are still a number of statistical problems with equation (6.15), the main one remains autocorrelation. This was corrected once again using the Cochrane-Orcutt technique, which gave the following results:

**Cochrane-Orcutt Method AR(1) Converged after 2 iterations**

1870–1979

\[ \ln T = 1.3282 + 1.0337 \ln Y \]  
\[ (22.8739) (155.0922) \]

\[ R^2 = 0.99946 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.03280 \]

\[ n = 110 \]

\[ k = 1 \]

\[ D.W. = 1.8117 \quad [d_u = 1.522 \quad d_v = 1.562 \quad (4-d_v) = 2.438] \]

\[ t_{30} = 1.980 \]

\[ t_{35} = 1.658 \]

**Parameters of the Autoregressive Error Specification**

\[ U = 0.66676 U_{t-1} \]
\[ (9.1255) \]
Once again equation (6.16) gives very similar results to equation (6.15).

The overall conclusion from the statistical results are that, for the most part, total transactions are proportional to income. As Cramer (1981b) suggests;

".... this is largely fortuitous since it is the result of compensating movements in otherwise unrelated components of the total. It is not due to the predominance of current transactions commonly associated with income generation."

(Cramer, 1981b, p.309)

However, while these results suggest that $T$ and $Y$ are very similar, they are not identical, and there are a number of periods where the two series diverge, albeit briefly, except in the case of the late 1980s. In consequence it is important to test both income and transactions velocity in our empirical work.

6.9 Conclusion

The substitution of income velocity for transactions velocity has become prevalent in modern literature. This replacement is only acceptable if there is a strong and stable relationship between the two series. However, investigation of this problem has always been frustrated by the lack of a reliable source for transactions data. This chapter has attempted to construct such a series using Cramer's (1981a) framework. Nevertheless, it can at best, only be considered a rough estimate of the order of magnitude of
transactions. For there are numerous measurement problems, leading to assumptions and a great amount of extrapolation and interpolation. Given these reservations, it provides a number of interesting insights into transactions behaviour in the United Kingdom. These include the major changes which have taken place in the composition of total transactions between its three main components, current, transfer, and asset and portfolio adjustment, over the last century. There also appears to be a stable relationship between transactions and income, at least until the late 1980s, although major deviations can occur. Whether this relationship is close enough to allow simple substitution is a matter for debate.
Chapter 7
The Long-run Relationship

7.1 Introduction

The review of monetary theory concerning the determinants of velocity identified two distinct groups of variables. Those which are associated with long-run behaviour, in particular institutional change, and a second collection which have a short run impact. In addition two contrasting views of velocity behaviour were recognized. On the one hand, the monetarist view of a stable function of a few variables, including the opportunity cost of holding money or alternative assets, and permanent income. On the other hand, the alternative theory, that velocity follows a random walk. In line with Keynes's view that velocity is, for the most part, volatile and depends on the structure of banking, industrial practices, social habits, the distribution of income, and the effective cost of holding idle balances. The concept of cointegration is ideal in embracing and testing these arguments, as the model can be separated into long and short term elements. This chapter concerns itself with the long-run relationship, the next uses the error correction term generated here, to build a short run dynamic model.

7.2 The Long-run Model

The review of previous economic literature found four types of determinants in the long term; the traditional ones, wealth and interest rates; the institutional factors, those associated with monetization and financial development of a nation's economic infrastructure\(^1\). In consequence the long run model can be written
in general terms as;

Velocity = f (interest rates, wealth, monetization, financial sophistication)

Once the proposed model is identified, the first task is to consider each variable's definition, measurement, together with an interpretation of their behaviour in the United Kingdom for the period of interest 1870-1991.

Holding money has a certain opportunity cost, for money is just one way that an economic agent can hold their liquid wealth. Indeed, an individual may have a whole portfolio of assets each with different returns. In the traditional sense holding money has no return, therefore, as rates of return increase on alternative assets money is moved into these alternatives. As this takes place velocity is expected to rise. Following Bordo and Jonung (1987), the long term interest rate (RL) is measured by the rate of interest on consols (2.5%), as illustrated pictorially in figure 7.1. Lathane (1954, 1960) suggests that movements in long term interest rates are the main determinant of long run movements in velocity. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the rate of interest on consols was low. After 1910 they rose rapidly, reaching 5.32% in 1920. Between 1921 and 1947 RL for the most part declined. In the twenty five years following the Second World War, long term interest rates moved in an upward trend, reaching a peak of 13.01% in 1981, after which they fell back, levelling off at around 9%, until the late 1980's.
Klein (1974a and 1974b) suggests that studies in the demand for money that ignore the own rate of return on money, for instance seven day deposit accounts, underestimate the sensitivity of the demand for money to the opportunity cost of holding it. When market interest rates rise, so does the own rate of return on money. Therefore, the interest differential between money and alternative assets alters less than the value of market interest rates. The observed change in velocity under such circumstances should be attributed to the relatively smaller change in interest differentials, rather than the larger changes in the overall level of interest rates. In calculating the own rate of interest on money (ROWN), we follow Klein (1974b). This variable is constructed as:

\[ \text{ROWN} = \left(1 - \frac{H}{\text{OM}} \right) \text{RS} \]  

(7.1)

where \( H \) = the stock of high powered money, consisting of currency
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Figure 7.1
held by the public (C), plus reserves of the commercial banks (BRES). \( \text{CM3} \) = the money stock M3 (Capie and Webber definition), RS = the short term interest rate, measured by the Prime Bank Bill Rate. The own rate of return on money is illustrated in figure 7.2. It will be recalled from our earlier discussion that ROWN will enter the velocity function with a negative sign.
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Figure 7.2

The own rate of return on money is cyclical around a fairly constant mean between 1870 and 1933. The period 1934-1950 sees the variable follow a low of approximately 3.7%. In the post Second World War period it is cyclical around a steep upward trend.
Friedman (1959) concludes from his empirical work that the main determinant of the demand for money is permanent income, that is an average expected future income. In order to generate real per capita permanent income (PIM), we adjusted real per capita income (Y/PN) using Friedman's (1957) weights and accounted for the long term growth rate of real per capita income 1870-1991 of 1.42%. The formula used was:

\[
\left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)_t^p = \frac{\beta}{\beta - \alpha} \left[ w_1 \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)^p_{t-1} + w_2 \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)^p_{t-2} \right]
\] (7.2)

The permanent income series was generated using \( \alpha = 0.0142 \), \( \beta = 0.4 \), \( w_1 = 0.32968 \) and \( w_2 = 0.67032 \). \( \alpha \) being the long term growth rate of real per capita income, \( \beta \), \( w_1 \), \( w_2 \) as given by Friedman (1957). This produced the algorithm:

\[
\left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)_t^p = 1.0368 \left[ 0.32968 \frac{Y}{PN}_t + 0.67032 \frac{Y}{PN}_{t-1} \right]
\] (7.3)

The calculated series is shown in figure 7.3. This illustrates the fact that permanent income has risen during most of the sample period. However, there has been some criticism of this weighted method of obtaining permanent income, which in itself is a substitute for a measure of wealth. Hall (1978) suggests that current consumption is a good approximation for permanent income or wealth. A full discussion can be found in Hadjimatheou (1987). In consequence, real consumer expenditure (PCONNR), was considered as a substitute measure. Given that PIM and PCONNR follow a similar pattern, and for ease of comparison with earlier literature, the latter variable was not pursued.
A proxy for the financial sophistication of a country is the ratio of total non-bank financial assets to total financial assets (TNBFA/TFA), and represents a measure for financial institution development. This variable is expected to enter the velocity equation with a positive parameter. A graphical representation is shown in figure 7.4. It is interesting to note that this variable is similar in shape to income velocity itself. In 1870 over 90% of total financial assets were in the hands of the non-bank financial sector. However, with the rise of commercial banking in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century this ratio fell slowly, reaching a trough in 1947. Nevertheless, since the Second World War the rise of non-bank financial institutions have reversed this trend, and the ratio has grown rapidly, reaching 96% by 1988. The table in appendix D gives full details of the sources of this ratio.
It is unfortunate that direct measurement of monetization factors is not possible. It is, therefore, necessary to follow Bordo and Jonung (1987) and develop a number of proxy variables. The first of these is the ratio of the number of people working in non-agriculture pursuits (LNA) to the total number of people employed (L). As the primary sector declines in importance, this ratio will move towards one, and the demand for money will rise, as bartering and payments in kind, are replaced with money transactions. It is expected that this ratio will be positively related to the development of the monetary economy, and should, therefore, enter the velocity function with a negative sign. A plot of the ratio of labour in non-agricultural pursuits to total labour force is shown in figure 7.5. In 1870 84% of the employed labour force were not involved in agriculture, but with
mechanization and other technological advances by 1989 over 98% were employed outside farming. In other words, over the one hundred and twenty years under study, those people employed by the agricultural sector as a percentage of the total employed labour force, fell from 15.23% to 1.45%.

The second proxy is for the spread of commercial banking, which is measured as the currency money ratio. That is the currency (notes and coin in circulation outside the Bank of England (C)), divided by the total money stock measured by M3 (C+M3). The currency money ratio is expected to be negatively correlated with the development of the money economy and hence enter the velocity function with a positive sign. Figure 7.6 illustrates the currency money ratio for the United Kingdom. In 1870 24.48% of the money stock was made up by the currency component. This ratio
fell during the last quarter of the nineteenth century to a level period of about 17% between 1899 and 1913. At the start of the First World War, the currency money ratio began to rise, peaking at approximately 23.74% in 1918, from whence it fell until the mid 1930's. During the Second World War the ratio peaked again, falling back during the 1950's. The final high of the current post war period occurred in 1961, when currency made up 23.65% of the broad money stock. From then onwards, apart from a blip in the late 1970's, the ratio has fallen uniformly, reaching just 7.24% in 1988, reflecting the decline in use of currency in transactions.

Capie and Wood (1986) discuss a number of alternative monetization variables. Among these is the number of bank branches (BANKS), which are shown in figure 7.7. It is assumed
that the demand for money will rise as the number of bank branches increases. Therefore, this variable should enter the velocity function with a negative sign. The number of branches rose steadily until the start of the Second World War, and then fell during hostilities, when many branches were closed. The majority lost during this period were reopened after the war, although not all were restored. The 1950's and early 1960's were a period when the number of bank branches remained fairly constant. The late 1960's saw a flurry of activity, however, this was short lived, and the number of bank branches has declined ever since.
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Figure 7.7
With consideration of each proposed variable complete, it is now possible to write the long run model. It should be noted, that in line with earlier work this is semi-logarithmic in form.

\[ \ln V = f^{+}(RL, \text{ROWN}, \ln(Y/PN)^p, \ln(TNBFA/TFA), \ln(INBA/L), \ln(C/M), \ln \text{BANKS}) \]

where \( V \) = the velocity of circulation, \( RL \) = the long term interest rate (consols 2.5%), \( \text{ROWN} \) = own rate of interest on money, \( (Y/PN)^p \) = permanent income, \( \ln(TNBFA/TFA) \) = the ratio of total non bank financial assets to total financial assets, \( \ln(INBA/L) \) = the ratio of the number of people working in non agricultural pursuits to the total number of people employed, \( \ln(C/M) \) = the currency money ratio, and \( \ln \text{BANKS} \) = the number of bank branches.

7.3 Testing for Unit Roots

With the theoretical model derived, the next step is to consider the time series properties of the proposed variables, and check their order of integration. The augmented Dickey-Fuller equation;

\[ \Delta y_t = \alpha + \beta \text{time} + p y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{l} \theta_i \Delta y_{t-i} + e_t \quad (7.4) \]

was estimated for each variable, and the resulting statistical tests computed. These are reported in Table 7.1. Columns 2-4 report the \( \theta_1, \theta_2, \) and \( \theta_l \), statistics derived from Dickey and Fuller (1981), with 5% critical values given in parenthesis. Column 5 is the standard t statistic for the constant \( \alpha \), with
standard 95% critical values in parenthesis. Column 6 is the equivalent for the parameter on time, \( \beta \). Column 7 declares whether the time series is trended or not, which in turn affects the computation and critical values of the ADF statistics. Column 8 reports the ADF for the non differenced series. If the series is not stationary, it is differenced, and the resulting ADF statistic reported in column 9. This process is repeated in columns 10 and 11 where necessary, until stationarity is achieved. Column 12 reports the number of lags required in the augmented Dickey Fuller equation to eliminate autocorrelation.

We begin with the income velocity series. To eliminate serial correlation in the residuals of the augmented Dickey Fuller equation, just one lag in the first difference of \( \ln V_t \) was required. Table 7.1, therefore, reports the results of the ADF(1) regression. A variable deletion test, which imposes zero coefficients on \( V_{t-1} \) and the time trend, give a computed value of 3.0243 for \( \theta \). The critical value for \( \theta \) can be found in Dickey and Fuller (1981). Using hypothesis tests at the 5% significance level, and 100 observations (the regression actually uses 119), we find a critical value of 6.49. As computed \( \theta \) is less than the critical value, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, implying that the series contains a unit root. Using the sequential procedure for unit root testing suggested by Holden and Perman (1994), we consider the t statistic for \( \ln V_{t-1} \) to test for \( p = 1 \). As it is assumed that \( \beta \) is zero, non standard critical values are required, and these are obtained from Fuller (1976), Table 8.5.2. The relevant t statistic is reported in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\alpha_1$</th>
<th>$\alpha_2$</th>
<th>$\alpha_3$</th>
<th>$t_1$ (constant)</th>
<th>$t_{time}$</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>I(0)</th>
<th>I(1)</th>
<th>I(2)</th>
<th>I(3)</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln V1</td>
<td>0.19812</td>
<td>.02552</td>
<td>.02657</td>
<td>.02651 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-2.8271</td>
<td>-5.9267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln V2</td>
<td>2.3400</td>
<td>.8267</td>
<td>.2490</td>
<td>.2311 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-1.7624</td>
<td>-7.7625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln Y/log</td>
<td>6.3536</td>
<td>.0292</td>
<td>.4266</td>
<td>.4416 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
<td>0.27641</td>
<td>-6.3423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>5.0288</td>
<td>.2354</td>
<td>.7716</td>
<td>.18399 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-0.72136</td>
<td>-6.0796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMV</td>
<td>3.7851</td>
<td>.5008</td>
<td>.1153</td>
<td>-0.73975 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-0.4912</td>
<td>-4.8597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln TRUS/TPA</td>
<td>2.1917</td>
<td>.0469</td>
<td>.5225</td>
<td>-1.3970 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-0.99857</td>
<td>-3.8339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln C/MGO</td>
<td>2.0980</td>
<td>.1459</td>
<td>.3055</td>
<td>.13020 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>non</td>
<td>0.55860</td>
<td>-8.1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln TRUS/TPA</td>
<td>6.1647</td>
<td>.9647</td>
<td>7.8651</td>
<td>-3.3151 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>trended</td>
<td>-3.0552</td>
<td>-3.1865</td>
<td>-10.7649</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln BMERS</td>
<td>6.7743</td>
<td>.8461</td>
<td>9.2407</td>
<td>.14116 (1.96)</td>
<td>-2.5912 (1.96)</td>
<td>trended</td>
<td>0.26936</td>
<td>-4.4618</td>
<td>-3.4478</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The computed value of -2.4271 is higher than the critical value of -2.8855, so this reinforces our earlier inference that the income velocity series contains a unit root. To determine whether a drift component is present, the value of the $\Phi_2$ statistic is calculated. This is derived using a variable deletion test, which imposes zero coefficients on $\ln V_{t-1}$, the time trend, and the intercept. $\Phi_2$ is the resulting F statistic. As the computed $\Phi_2$, 2.0252 is less than the critical value of 4.88, it is not possible to reject the null hypothesis, which implies the absence of a drift in the process. We can reinforce our conclusions by using the $\Phi_1$ statistic to test the null hypothesis of a unit root and zero drift. In this instance $\Phi_1$ is 0.19812, smaller than the critical value of 4.71. Therefore it is not possible to reject the null. Having established the series is not I(0), we need to confirm that the income velocity series requires only to be differenced once to achieve stationarity. The above process is repeated for the differenced variable, although not reported here, and the corresponding ADF statistic is shown in column 9 of table 7.1. This is -5.9267, smaller than the critical value of -2.8857, and this confirms that the income velocity series is I(1).

The sequential procedure for unit root testing is conducted for each of the proposed long run relationship variables. The transactions velocity series (V2) is a random walk without drift. The permanent income series ($\ln(Y/PN)^p$) is a random walk with drift. While RL, ROWN, $\ln(TNBFA/TFA)$, and $\ln(C/M)$ are all random
walks without drift. All the above variables are also I(1).
However, the computed ϕ, statistic for the ratio of the number of people working in non agricultural pursuits to the total number of people employed, ln(NA/L), is larger than the corresponding critical value. Therefore, the null hypothesis, \( H_0: (a, \beta, \rho) = (a, 0, 1) \) is rejected. So we know that either \( [\beta = 0, \rho = 1] \) or \( [\beta \neq 0, \rho = 1] \). The next step is to test for \( \rho = 1 \) using the corresponding t statistic obtained in the augmented Dickey Fuller equation. Critical values from the standard normal tables are used when \( \beta \) is non-zero. These tests conclude that \( \rho, a, \) and \( \beta \) are significantly different from zero, and implies that the series is a random walk about a non-linear time trend. This outcome being highly unusual for an economic time series (see Holden and Perman, 1994, pp.57-58 for a detailed explanation). To achieve stationarity the ln (NA/L) series has to be differenced twice. The fact that it is I(2) is confirmed by the ADF statistic in column 10 of table 7.1.

The final long run variable to consider is the number of bank branches. Once again the computed ϕ, statistic is larger than the corresponding critical value, and the null hypothesis \( H_0: (a, \beta, \rho) = (a, 0, 1) \) is rejected. Further tests on \( a, \beta, \) and \( \rho \) suggest the series is a random walk with a linear trend. Nonetheless, the ln BANKS series requires differencing only once to achieve stationarity, and consequently is an I(1) variable.
7.4 Unit Root Testing in the Presence of Structural Breaks

Perron (1989) argues that unit root tests which do not take into account the possibility of structural breaks may have low power. The point of a structural break may be detected informally by consulting a plot of each variable. Alternatively, it may be identified by plotting recursive estimates of \( p \), in the augmented Dickey Fuller regression, and seeking periods of coefficient instability, which may be consistent with a structural break. A more formal approach, is to select the break point which minimizes the t statistic on \( \rho_{t-1} \) in regressions for all possible values of the structural break date.

In order to test for the existence of a unit root conditional on the potential presence of structural breaks we use the following equation, as specified by Holden and Perman (1994).

\[
\Delta y_t = \alpha + \delta DU_t + \beta \text{time}_t + \gamma DT_t + \rho DTB_t + \sum_{i=1}^{j-k} c_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \epsilon_t
\]  

where \( TB \) = time of the possible break, \( DU_t = 1 \) if \( t > TB \) and 0 otherwise, \( DT_t = \text{time if } t > TB \) and 0 otherwise, \( D(TB)_t = 1 \) at \( t = TB + 1 \) and 0 otherwise. \( DU_t \) and \( DT_t \) allow the intercept and the trend coefficient to change after the possible break. \( D(TB)_t \) allows for a jump in the series at \( TB + 1 \). If the parameters on the lags of \( \Delta y_t \) are significant, this is in line with the view that there is a gradual change in the intercept and trend.
starting at TB. Otherwise the changes take place instantaneously. 
The null hypothesis of a unit root requires \( p=1 \) and \( v=\beta=0 \). The alternative hypothesis of a trend stationary process requires \( p < 1, \beta, v, \) and \( \theta = 0 \) and \( d \) to be close to zero.

The hypothesis is tested using the t statistic on the \( \rho \) parameter, and comparing it with the critical values given in Perron (1989), Table VI.B p.1377. If the computed \( t_\rho \) is higher than the critical value we accept the null hypothesis that the series contains a unit root. Otherwise we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative. The critical values used are dependent on the position of the possible time break. This is given as:

\[
\lambda = \frac{T_b}{T}
\]

where \( T_b \) is the observation number associated with the year selected for the possible structural break (eg. 1870=1, 1900=31), and \( T \) is the total number of observations, (in our case 121). If the null is rejected then hypothesis tests for the other parameters use the conventional t and F statistics.

The Perron equation to test for unit roots in the presence of possible structural breaks was estimated for each of the proposed long run variables (excluding ln(LNA/L)). The results are reported in table 7.2. Column 2 gives the possible date of break in the trend function. Column 3 is the value of the truncation lag parameter \( k \). Columns 4-8 give the key parameters with critical values in parenthesis. Column 9 reports \( \rho \). Column 10 gives the t statistic associated with \( \rho \), with its corresponding critical
value taken from Perron (1989). Column 11 indicates the position of the break, and corresponding ratio. At the 5% significance level, the null hypothesis of a unit root is maintained for seven of the eight series. The exception is the own rate of interest (ROWN) with a break date of 1931. The computed t statistic on $p$ is -4.6284, while the critical value equals -4.24. Therefore the null hypothesis cannot be accepted and the alternative hypothesis of stationary fluctuations around a determining breaking trend function is adopted. As the unit root hypothesis can be rejected, it is possible to assess the significance of the other coefficients given the fact that the asymptotic distribution of their t statistic is standardized normal. The constant ($a$) is not significant, while the post break constant dummy ($\theta$) is significant. The trend ($\beta$) is not significant, although the opposite is true for the post break slope dummy ($\nu$). The break dummy ($d$) is not significantly different from zero at the 95% level (1.96) but is at the 90% level (1.64). These results suggest that ROWN does not possess a unit root, is untrended until 1931 and exhibits a positive trend from that point. It could be argued that these results be preferred to those of the standard Dickey Fuller tests. However, given how close $t_c$ is to its critical value, and given the fact that large sample test procedures are being concluded, we regard the above evidence on the unit root in the own rate of interest series as inconclusive. Nevertheless, we use the Perron equation to test for unit roots in the presence of possible structural breaks for all the series in first differences. In all cases the unit root hypothesis is rejected, as expected. These are reported in Table 7.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$r_{21}$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$g$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$t_r$</th>
<th>$\lambda$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln $V1$</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.065681</td>
<td>-0.079527</td>
<td>0.0002688</td>
<td>0.00855</td>
<td>-0.11005</td>
<td>-0.11243</td>
<td>-3.1458</td>
<td>49/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0956)</td>
<td>(1.9121)</td>
<td>(10.047903)</td>
<td>(1.2671)</td>
<td>(1.9833)</td>
<td>(1.9833)</td>
<td>[-4.21]</td>
<td>0.40495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln $V2$</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.39436</td>
<td>-0.2777</td>
<td>0.000333</td>
<td>0.001510</td>
<td>-0.11909</td>
<td>-0.14023</td>
<td>-3.2778</td>
<td>50/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2611)</td>
<td>(2.7222)</td>
<td>(10.057942)</td>
<td>(1.9928)</td>
<td>(1.9833)</td>
<td>(1.9833)</td>
<td>[-4.21]</td>
<td>0.4132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln $V/BV$</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.38336</td>
<td>-0.297230</td>
<td>0.00061</td>
<td>0.005630</td>
<td>0.02035</td>
<td>-0.034731</td>
<td>-0.04620</td>
<td>52/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09314)</td>
<td>(1.3262)</td>
<td>(10.07955)</td>
<td>(1.0941)</td>
<td>(1.1190)</td>
<td>(1.1190)</td>
<td>[-4.21]</td>
<td>0.4297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.012755</td>
<td>-0.019372</td>
<td>0.0002589</td>
<td>0.005178</td>
<td>0.010000</td>
<td>-0.0075218</td>
<td>-0.02672</td>
<td>33/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.45686)</td>
<td>(0.18966)</td>
<td>(0.35328)</td>
<td>(0.14737)</td>
<td>(0.14737)</td>
<td>(0.14737)</td>
<td>[-3.99]</td>
<td>0.2727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.007264</td>
<td>-0.087575</td>
<td>0.0015112</td>
<td>0.00562</td>
<td>0.01975</td>
<td>0.01570</td>
<td>-0.010730</td>
<td>-2.8079</td>
<td>50/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.085387)</td>
<td>(1.7966)</td>
<td>(10.1822)</td>
<td>(1.3878)</td>
<td>(1.03297)</td>
<td>(1.03297)</td>
<td>[-4.21]</td>
<td>0.4132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC08</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.087786</td>
<td>-0.089729</td>
<td>0.0047728</td>
<td>-0.008865</td>
<td>0.37400</td>
<td>-0.027406</td>
<td>-1.9335</td>
<td>28/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27488)</td>
<td>(0.48644)</td>
<td>(0.32355)</td>
<td>(0.10400)</td>
<td>(1.1364)</td>
<td>(1.1364)</td>
<td>[-3.65]</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12705</td>
<td>-0.1800</td>
<td>0.0034181</td>
<td>0.020615</td>
<td>-0.54064</td>
<td>0.05240</td>
<td>-0.29490</td>
<td>-1.9393</td>
<td>71/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41384)</td>
<td>(1.4775)</td>
<td>(1.5381)</td>
<td>(1.8696)</td>
<td>(1.6764)</td>
<td>(1.6764)</td>
<td>[-4.24]</td>
<td>0.24113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln $Z_1$</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.003160</td>
<td>-0.012397</td>
<td>-0.0003479</td>
<td>0.001725</td>
<td>0.0030773</td>
<td>-0.029460</td>
<td>-1.9431</td>
<td>46/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.10013)</td>
<td>(2.1715)</td>
<td>(10.36197)</td>
<td>(1.5132)</td>
<td>(1.38016)</td>
<td>(1.38016)</td>
<td>[-4.17]</td>
<td>0.3719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0032348</td>
<td>0.008417</td>
<td>-0.015052</td>
<td>0.004306</td>
<td>-0.0085955</td>
<td>0.056867</td>
<td>-1.3068</td>
<td>71/121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01108)</td>
<td>(0.9040)</td>
<td>(1.1131)</td>
<td>(1.7413)</td>
<td>(1.0501)</td>
<td>(1.0501)</td>
<td>[-4.24]</td>
<td>0.3033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln IC/GO</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.120383</td>
<td>0.068125</td>
<td>0.00705</td>
<td>-0.0011738</td>
<td>0.0057231</td>
<td>0.0033735</td>
<td>0.15244</td>
<td>46/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36989)</td>
<td>(1.8950)</td>
<td>(10.4472)</td>
<td>(1.2395)</td>
<td>(1.2997)</td>
<td>(1.2997)</td>
<td>[-4.21]</td>
<td>0.39669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.12445</td>
<td>0.39862</td>
<td>0.0192238</td>
<td>0.0091128</td>
<td>-0.0252143</td>
<td>0.074581</td>
<td>0.074581</td>
<td>0.16885</td>
<td>46/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0699)</td>
<td>(1.9515)</td>
<td>(10.12497)</td>
<td>(1.2345)</td>
<td>(1.2703)</td>
<td>(1.2703)</td>
<td>[-4.18]</td>
<td>0.39431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln BR233</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.077410</td>
<td>0.037221</td>
<td>0.0013052</td>
<td>0.0016834</td>
<td>0.081155</td>
<td>0.0090876</td>
<td>-0.60703</td>
<td>26/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.67491)</td>
<td>(1.7657)</td>
<td>(10.17391)</td>
<td>(1.9213)</td>
<td>(1.4213)</td>
<td>(1.4213)</td>
<td>[-3.91]</td>
<td>0.218476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.083857</td>
<td>-0.036956</td>
<td>0.0018555</td>
<td>0.0027699</td>
<td>-0.027861</td>
<td>0.052233</td>
<td>-0.16299</td>
<td>-1.5249</td>
<td>71/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4680)</td>
<td>(0.98076)</td>
<td>(1.1914)</td>
<td>(1.2537)</td>
<td>(1.96347)</td>
<td>(1.96347)</td>
<td>[-3.24]</td>
<td>0.63877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>( T_n )</td>
<td>( k )</td>
<td>( a )</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>( d )</td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td>( \tau_1 )</td>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0075880 (0.41868)</td>
<td>-0.008935 (0.02616)</td>
<td>-0.001145 (0.32060)</td>
<td>0.002237 (0.32268)</td>
<td>0.006769 (1.0169)</td>
<td>-0.59230</td>
<td>-5.5671 (-4.22)</td>
<td>45/121 + 0.40495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0472336 (0.25865)</td>
<td>0.010498 (0.41709)</td>
<td>0.001900 (0.11341)</td>
<td>0.0004434 (0.063622)</td>
<td>-0.18375 (3.0397)</td>
<td>-0.89161</td>
<td>-8.2485 (-4.23)</td>
<td>50/121 + 0.41323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/TND</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.052557 (3.0601)</td>
<td>-0.016452 (1.2968)</td>
<td>-0.005384 (2.2706)</td>
<td>0.006050 (2.1699)</td>
<td>0.023064 (0.844133)</td>
<td>-0.66522</td>
<td>-9.7795 (-4.23)</td>
<td>52/121 + 0.42973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.021005 (0.42956)</td>
<td>0.048600 (0.61681)</td>
<td>0.004968 (0.33985)</td>
<td>-0.004933 (0.33095)</td>
<td>-0.0047330 (0.666362)</td>
<td>-0.83379</td>
<td>-6.0904 (-3.88)</td>
<td>33/121 + 0.27273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.031046 (1.3464)</td>
<td>0.0209221 (0.061473)</td>
<td>0.0014426 (1.9395)</td>
<td>-0.0012566 (1.2230)</td>
<td>-0.0027322 (0.78819)</td>
<td>-0.68303</td>
<td>-6.3689 (-4.22)</td>
<td>50/121 + 0.41323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.055223 (0.93424)</td>
<td>0.091295 (0.66998)</td>
<td>0.006042 (0.89008)</td>
<td>-0.0069297 (0.78963)</td>
<td>0.025901 (0.76213)</td>
<td>1.2010</td>
<td>-6.4376 (-3.64)</td>
<td>28/121 + 0.2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/GNI/</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.044310 (0.48856)</td>
<td>-0.036105 (1.07071)</td>
<td>0.0018809 (0.56894)</td>
<td>-0.0005139 (0.45244)</td>
<td>-1.1163 (3.1782)</td>
<td>-1.1785</td>
<td>-6.7307 (-4.24)</td>
<td>61/121 + 0.50413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA/FDI</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.006649 (0.12167)</td>
<td>-0.002845 (0.00501)</td>
<td>-0.0000707 (0.07704)</td>
<td>-0.0000787 (0.71338)</td>
<td>-0.0002365 (0.04147)</td>
<td>-0.55195</td>
<td>-1.1908 (-4.18)</td>
<td>46/121 + 0.3719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON/FO</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001262 (0.64113)</td>
<td>0.010265 (1.2165)</td>
<td>-0.00007672 (0.15771)</td>
<td>-0.0000648 (0.65161)</td>
<td>-0.001751 (1.3119)</td>
<td>-0.71064</td>
<td>-1.5152 (-4.26)</td>
<td>73/121 + 0.6033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC/PO</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.018093 (1.13317)</td>
<td>0.054672 (0.09701)</td>
<td>0.0072123 (1.9714)</td>
<td>-0.0012756 (1.5326)</td>
<td>-0.062650 (1.6980)</td>
<td>-0.55374</td>
<td>-5.8499 (-4.52)</td>
<td>46/121 + 0.39669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRAS</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.0072730 (0.78822)</td>
<td>0.20513 (2.5831)</td>
<td>0.001304 (0.75145)</td>
<td>-0.0022833 (0.8559)</td>
<td>0.079820 (0.8999)</td>
<td>-0.69318</td>
<td>-6.6553 (-4.18)</td>
<td>84/121 + 0.58821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHANES</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0051884 (0.41997)</td>
<td>0.013106 (1.5847)</td>
<td>0.0012702 (0.7850)</td>
<td>-0.0016875 (0.3158)</td>
<td>-0.084000 (3.3822)</td>
<td>-0.84842</td>
<td>-7.4742 (-3.99)</td>
<td>26/121 + 0.218476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/W</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31769 (3.94811)</td>
<td>0.026175 (0.98179)</td>
<td>-0.0040844 (2.5491)</td>
<td>-0.0022004 (0.81447)</td>
<td>-0.021763 (0.81368)</td>
<td>-0.75532</td>
<td>-6.1670 (-4.34)</td>
<td>75/121 + 0.53877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As stated earlier, usually only I(1) variables will occur in any long run relationship. All the proposed variables of the long run model are I(1) except the ratio of the number of people working in non agricultural pursuits to the total number of people employed (ln(LNA/L)), which is I(2). Consequently, this variable is dropped from the proposed specification. It should be noted that Siklos (1993) also drops this variable, due to lack of variation in the post war period. The doubts concerning the stationarity of ROWN arising from the structural break of 1931 remain, although it is not omitted. The long term model for Johansen estimation purposes thus becomes:

$$\ln V = f(\text{RL}, \text{ROWN}, \ln(Y/PN)^+, \ln(TNBA/TA)^+, \ln(C/M), \ln(BANKS))$$

7.5 Cointegration Analysis

Before proceeding with the Johansen estimation, it is necessary to determine the lag length $k$ of the VAR (vector autoregressive model). Sequential F tests were calculated, starting with a large value of $k$, (3 in this case), and the specification reestimated for ever smaller values of $k$. A variable deletion F test was used to ascertain the smallest lag length which is acceptable. This should be large enough to ensure that the residuals are approximately white noise. The computed F tests and critical values are shown in Table 7.4.
Table 7.4 Determination of the lag length \( k \) of the VAR (vector autoregressive model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Velocity Model (VI)</th>
<th>Lag Length</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 0</td>
<td>( F(21,91) = 15.5969 )</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>( F(14,91) = 2.2154 )</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 2</td>
<td>( F(7,91) = 1.8987 )</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactions Velocity Model (V2)</th>
<th>Lag Length</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 0</td>
<td>( F(21,91) = 7.7537 )</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>( F(14,91) = 1.9581 )</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 2</td>
<td>( F(7,91) = 1.2566 )</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that for both the income and transactions velocity models, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected until the lag length is reduced from 2 to 1. Therefore, the VAR is set at 2 for both models.

The next step is to apply the Johansen estimation techniques. First, let us consider income velocity (VI). Initial analysis of the model suggested the possibility of two cointegrating vectors. However, consulting the corresponding vectors revealed that while all variables are significantly different from zero, the sign of the parameter on \( \ln(C/M) \) in vector one, and RL in
vector 2 are incorrect. The model was reestimated omitting ln BANKS. This again suggested two vectors. Unfortunately, there are problems with the two associated vectors. The parameters on ln(C/M) in both vectors are of the incorrect sign. Additionally, the parameters on ln(Y/PN)^, ROWN, and ln(TNBFA/TFA) in vector two also have inappropriate signs. Furthermore, the parameters on ln(Y/PN)^, ln(TNBFA/TFA) and ln(C/M) are not significantly different from zero. Finally, the long term model for income velocity was reduced to:

\[ \ln V1 = f (RL, ROWN, \ln(Y/PN)^, \ln(TNBFA/TFA)) \]

interest rates wealth financial sophistication

The corresponding Johansen test statistics are reported in Table 7.5. Both the LR tests, the maximal eigenvalue and the trace of the stochastic matrix suggest just one cointegrating vector. This is exhibited in Table 7.6. All the parameters are of the correct sign, and are significantly different from zero. The single cointegrating vector in normalized form is:

\[ (-1.00 0.44685 0.11847 -0.26820 6.97990) \]

corresponding to a long run relationship of:

\[ \ln V1 = 0.44685 \ln(Y/PN)_t^ + 0.11847 RL_t - 0.26820 ROWN_t \\
+ 6.97990 \ln \left( \frac{TNBFA}{TFA} \right)_t \]
Table 7.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>95% critical value</th>
<th>90% critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r=0</td>
<td>r&gt;=1</td>
<td>46.5975</td>
<td>33.4610</td>
<td>30.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=1</td>
<td>r&gt;=2</td>
<td>19.2936</td>
<td>27.0670</td>
<td>24.7340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=2</td>
<td>r&gt;=3</td>
<td>14.7398</td>
<td>20.9670</td>
<td>18.5980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=3</td>
<td>r&gt;=4</td>
<td>7.4940</td>
<td>14.0690</td>
<td>12.0710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=4</td>
<td>r&gt;=5</td>
<td>1.1581</td>
<td>3.7620</td>
<td>2.6870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LR Test Based on Maximal Eigenvalue of the Stochastic Matrix (with trend in DGP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>95% critical value</th>
<th>90% critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r=0</td>
<td>r&gt;=1</td>
<td>89.2829</td>
<td>68.5240</td>
<td>64.8430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=1</td>
<td>r&gt;=2</td>
<td>42.6855</td>
<td>47.2100</td>
<td>43.9490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=2</td>
<td>r&gt;=3</td>
<td>23.3919</td>
<td>29.6800</td>
<td>26.7850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=3</td>
<td>r&gt;=4</td>
<td>8.6521</td>
<td>15.4100</td>
<td>13.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=4</td>
<td>r&gt;=5</td>
<td>1.1581</td>
<td>3.7620</td>
<td>2.6870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Vector 1</td>
<td>χ²(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln V1</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Y/PN)²</td>
<td>0.44685</td>
<td>6.7338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>0.11847</td>
<td>7.6096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWN</td>
<td>-0.26820</td>
<td>25.9589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(TNBFA/ TFA)</td>
<td>6.97990</td>
<td>17.0568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic interpretation of the long run relationship is not straightforward. Cointegrating vectors are obtained from the reduced form of a system of jointly endogenous variables. Therefore, they cannot be interpreted in the same way as structural equations, as it is difficult to go back from the reduced form to the structure. However, Bernake (1986) and Blanchard and Quah (1989) have shown that it is possible to give a structural interpretation to these vectors by imposing identifying restrictions on the reduced form parameters. Nevertheless, for our purposes, the Johansen vectors can be thought of as a constraint that an economic structure imposes on the long run relationship of the jointly endogenous variables.

The residuals and residuals adjusted for short run dynamics are shown in figures 7.8 and 7.9 respectively.
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Informal analysis appears to confirm stationarity. However, there appears to be outliers in 1939, 1964, 1983. Nonetheless, stationarity is confirmed by the Augmented Dickey Fuller test, $ADF(2) = -4.4321 [-2.89]$, and the null hypothesis of a unit root is rejected.

Let us return to transactions velocity ($V_2$). The Johansen test statistics are reported in Table 7.7, these are for the full long term model. Using the 95% critical value criteria, the LR test based on the maximal eigenvalue of the stochastic matrix suggests two cointegrating vectors. While the LR test based on the trace of stochastic matrix suggests three vectors. These were estimated, and are shown in Table 7.8. The first point to note, is the fact that according to the $\chi^2$ tests, all parameters are significantly different from zero. However, vector one is rejected because the parameters on RL and ROWN are of the incorrect sign. Furthermore, vector three is not acceptable due to the negative sign on RL. Nevertheless, vector two is acceptable, and in normalized form is:

$$(-1.00 0.251970 0.027783 -0.045524 3.06910 0.046472 -0.104130)$$

corresponding to a long run relationship of:

$$\ln V_2 = 0.2520 \ln(Y/PN) + 0.030 RL_t - 0.0455 \ln \text{ROWN}_t$$
$$+ 3.069 \ln(\text{TNBFA/TFA})_t + 0.0465 \ln(C/M)_t$$
$$- 0.1041 \ln \text{BANKS}_t$$

Earlier discussion on the problems associated with economic interpretation are also relevant here.
For a full discussion on the ordering and choice of vectors when the Johansen tests suggest more than one, see Adam (1991), Arestis and Biefang-Prisancho Mariscal (1994) and Clements and Mizon (1991). Furthermore, a recent paper by Pesaran and Shin (1994) argues that in the case where there are more than one cointegrating vector, the statistical approach to identification of the long-run cointegrating relations is not satisfactory. This can lead to misinterpretation of empirical results and has implications for policy analysis. Pesaran and Shin (1994) provide appropriate algorithms to overcome this problem. Furthermore, in a later paper Pesaran and Shin (1995) show that:

"it is possible to complement the long-run analysis with some insight into the dynamics of the adjustments of the economic model by estimating "persistence profiles", namely the time profiles of the effects of shocks on the cointegrating relations that are invariant to the way shocks in the underlying VAR model are orthogonalized."

(Pesaran and Shin (1994, p.36)

The empirical work contained here, has not been able to benefit from such recent econometric developments.

The residuals and adjusted residuals for short run dynamics are illustrated in figures 7.9 and 7.10.
Table 7.7

120 observations from 1872-1991 Maximum Lag in VAR = 2
List of variables included in cointegrating vector:
ln V2, ln(Y/PN)^*, RL, ROWN, ln(TNBFA/TFA), ln(C/M), ln BANKS

List of eigenvalues in descending order: 0.38237
0.28241 0.23756 0.19407 0.076702 0.054726 0.002248

LR Test Based on Maximal Eigenvalue of the Stochastic Matrix (with trend in DGP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>95% critical value</th>
<th>90% critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r=0</td>
<td>r&gt;=1</td>
<td>57.8244</td>
<td>45.2770</td>
<td>42.3170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r&gt;=2</td>
<td>39.8234</td>
<td>39.3720</td>
<td>36.7620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=2</td>
<td>r&gt;=3</td>
<td>32.5472</td>
<td>33.4610</td>
<td>30.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=3</td>
<td>r&gt;=4</td>
<td>25.8909</td>
<td>27.0670</td>
<td>24.7340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=4</td>
<td>r&gt;=5</td>
<td>9.5764</td>
<td>20.9670</td>
<td>18.5980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=5</td>
<td>r&gt;=6</td>
<td>6.7537</td>
<td>14.0690</td>
<td>12.0710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=6</td>
<td>r&gt;=7</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>3.7620</td>
<td>2.6370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LR Test Based on Trace of Stochastic Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>95% critical value</th>
<th>90% critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r=0</td>
<td>r&gt;=1</td>
<td>172.4430</td>
<td>124.2430</td>
<td>118.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r&gt;=2</td>
<td>114.6185</td>
<td>94.1550</td>
<td>89.4830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=2</td>
<td>r&gt;=3</td>
<td>74.7951</td>
<td>68.5240</td>
<td>64.8430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=3</td>
<td>r&gt;=4</td>
<td>42.2479</td>
<td>47.2100</td>
<td>43.9490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=4</td>
<td>r&gt;=5</td>
<td>16.3571</td>
<td>29.6800</td>
<td>26.7850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=5</td>
<td>r&gt;=6</td>
<td>6.7807</td>
<td>15.4100</td>
<td>13.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r=6</td>
<td>r&gt;=7</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>3.7620</td>
<td>2.6370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.8

Sample 1872-1991 Maximum lag in VAR = 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Vector 1</th>
<th>Vector 2</th>
<th>Vector 3</th>
<th>$\chi^2(3)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln V2</td>
<td>-1.000000</td>
<td>-1.000000</td>
<td>-1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Y/PN)</td>
<td>0.327080</td>
<td>0.251970</td>
<td>1.021100</td>
<td>11.7198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>-0.063278</td>
<td>0.027783</td>
<td>-0.026333</td>
<td>16.4432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWN</td>
<td>0.106330</td>
<td>-0.045524</td>
<td>-0.041439</td>
<td>28.0743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(TMBFA/TFA)</td>
<td>1.592100</td>
<td>3.069100</td>
<td>4.185800</td>
<td>12.9528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(C/M)</td>
<td>0.496940</td>
<td>0.046472</td>
<td>0.597530</td>
<td>16.0173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln BANKS</td>
<td>-0.118480</td>
<td>-0.104130</td>
<td>-0.382800</td>
<td>9.7594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value $\chi^2(3) = 7.815$

Figure 7.10
While the residuals appear stationary, there are outliers in 1987 and 1989. This is an issue we will return to later in the thesis. The Augmented Dickey Fuller statistic confirms stationarity. \[ ADF(2) = -3.5188 [-2.89] \].

This chapter has established long run relationships for both income and transactions velocity. In the case of income velocity, this is a function of the long term interest rate, the own rate of interest on money, and the ratio of total non bank financial assets to total financial assets. While the long term transactions velocity function contains these variables and additionally the currency money ratio and the number of bank branches. These results are in line with the monetarist view of a stable function of just a few variables.
Chapter 8

The Short-run Dynamic Relationship - Model

8.1 Introduction

The preceding section of the thesis established a long-term relationship between velocity and a small number of explanatory variables. This chapter is concerned with the second step of cointegration, the construction of a short-run dynamic model, using the lagged residuals from the long run model as an error correction mechanism.

8.2 The Short Run Model - Preliminary View

The examination of earlier economic literature distinguishes a greater number of determinants for the short run model, than the long term one. In addition to the four types of variable already identified; interest rates, wealth, financial sophistication, and monetization; one can add; economic stability, GDP and monetary shocks, value of time, expected inflation, and financial innovation. As a result, the short run model can be written in broad terms as;

\[
\text{Velocity} = f(\text{interest rates, wealth, financial sophistication, monetization, economic stability, GDP and monetary shocks, value of time, expected inflation, financial innovation, error correction term})
\]

Before moving on to the empirical work, it is necessary to consider the definition, measurement, and economic behaviour in the United Kingdom of these additional variables.
8.3 Interest Rates

Klein (1973), among others, argues that a short term interest rate be introduced into the velocity function, adjoining the long term one. Ensuing Bordo and Jonung (1987) this is measured as the Prime Bank Bill Rate (RS), as illustrated in figure 8.1.

In the period 1870-1930 cyclical short term interest rates moved around a stationary mean. In the early 1930s they fell to a historical low, where they remained until after the Second World War. In the post war period RS has fluctuated around an upward trend.

So far only domestic interest rates have been considered. However, over the last decade empirical work has paid attention to open economy considerations. Brittain (1981) constructs a foreign portfolio term, which reflects the difference between
domestic and foreign interest rates. This variable is expected to enter the velocity function with a negative sign.

\[ RFOR = (r_f - r_d) \]  \hspace{1cm} (8.1)

where \( r_d \) = a domestic rate of interest, \( r_f \) = a foreign rate of interest. The German scenario is chosen, and the differential between the German Private short term interest rate (RGER) and the domestic Prime Bank Bill Rate (RS) is considered. The resulting portfolio term (RFORG) is shown in figure 8.2.

The foreign portfolio term is cyclical around zero until 1920. After a positive peak, domestic interest rates are higher than German interest rates until the mid 1960s. The final twenty five years are characterised by German interest rates being higher than United Kingdom ones.
8.4 Wealth - Transitory Income

It follows from our earlier discussion of permanent income in chapter three, that both measured income, and measured consumption contain a permanent and a transitory element. Therefore the transitory income will have an affect on money demanded and hence velocity. This can be measured, according to Bordo and Jonung (1987), as the ratio of measured per capita real income to permanent per capita real income. The resulting variable (CYCLE) is illustrated in figure 8.3. It is cyclical in nature, but stationary around a constant mean for the whole sample period. There are two notable outliers in 1919 and 1940.

![Figure 8.3](image-url)
An alternative measure for fluctuations in income is the GDP gap, the difference between potential real output and actual real output. This is measured as:

\[ \text{YRGAP} = \ln \text{NNPR} - \ln \text{NNPTREND} \] (8.2)

where NNPR = Net National Product (constant prices), NNPTREND = the trend of NNPR. The resulting variable (YRGAP) is illustrated in figure 8.4.

8.5 Monetization

Capie and Wood (1986) suggest urbanization as an alternative measure to the share of the labour force in non-agricultural production, and this is the only additional monetization variable. The authors argue that it is possible that industries in rural areas were slow to monetize, so that the Bordo and Jonung measure may be misleading. The ratio of the population living in towns and cities to the population as a whole (POMPT),
is illustrated in figure 8.5. The latter half of the nineteenth century is characterised by an ever greater proportion of the population moving to the urban areas. However, the share of the population in major towns reaches a peak at the time of the start of the First World War. During the war, and immediately afterwards the urban population falls steeply. During the 1920s and early 1930s there is a modest increase in the population living in major towns. After 1934 there is a steady decline in the urban population. This is reversed during the 1960s, but a further decline takes place during the 1970s, a plateau being reached in the 1980s.

Figure 8.5
8.6 Economic Stability

In assessing their holdings of precautionary monetary balances, individuals will assess future economic stability. A proxy to encapsulate this argument based on Klein (1975), is measured as a six year moving standard deviation of the percentage change in real income per head (YSD).

\[
\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}
\]

(8.3)

A decline in the certainty about the future, reflected by an increase in the standard deviation should raise the precautionary demand for money and hence lower velocity. It is illustrated in figure 8.6.

Bordo and Jonung (1987) had little success with this variable, and introduced an alternative measure of economic stability in the form of the government's share in national income. This is
calculated as total government expenditure less interest payments on the national debt, divided by net national income. It is argued that increased government expenditure leads to growing economic stability and security and this in turn reduces the demand for money and raises velocity. The ratio (TG) is shown pictorially in figure 8.7.

It can be argued that defence expenditure, especially during the two world wars, distorts this measure. In consequence Bordo and Jonung offer an alternative in the form of total government expenditure less interest payments on the national debt and defence expenditure, divided by net national income. The resulting variable (TGDEF) is illustrated in figure 8.8.
Capie and Wood (1986) offer a similar but more precise definition in the form of the percentage of GDP spent on social services, defined as education, health, social security and unemployment benefits (SSG). This is shown in figure 8.9. Apart from the Second World War and the late 1980's, this variable has risen almost continuously.

One would expect a positive relationship between TG, TGDEF, SSG and velocity. However, the majority of empirical work has found that while significantly different from zero, the parameter is of a negative sign. A possible explanation is that these variables move counter cyclically to velocity, reflecting the stabilizing role played by many governments. (see Bordo and Jonung, 1987, p.42). Another explanation, is that increased government expenditure which is funded by the PSBR may lead to
an increase in the money supply before the impact is felt on nominal income. This would lower velocity, at least initially.

![Graph showing the percentage of GDP spent on Social Services (education, health, benefits).](image)

**Figure 8.9**

### 8.7 Income and Monetary Shocks

Another area of concern in accounting for short run behaviour, are the exogenous shocks to the velocity ratio, either to the numerator, nominal income, or denominator, the demand for money balances. Tatam (1983) suggests that labour strikes affect at least temporarily, reducing both production and spending. This is measured using the ratio of working days lost by strikes to labour force employed, as shown by STL in figure 8.10. The majority of working days lost through strike action took place in the first half of this century. The graph is dominated by the peak caused by the "General Strike". The other notable feature are the small peaks caused by a variety of coal miners strikes during the mid 1970s and early 1980s.
As discussed in chapter three, there are two components of G.D.P. whose unexpected variation may cause changes in velocity, these are inventories and imports. To measure this influence two additional variables are introduced. INVR, real inventories and work in progress, and MR, real imports, illustrated in figures 8.11 and 8.12 respectively. Real inventory and work in progress is dominated by the major trough in 1916, while real imports, for the most part, follow an upward trend, especially after the Second World War.
A reduction in direct taxation, ceteris paribus, will lead to an increase in consumption, which in turn causes a rise in the demand for transaction balances. Accordingly in the short run a reduction in direct taxes results in a decline in the velocity of money. The basic rate of income tax is illustrated in figure 8.13.

![Basic Rate of Income Tax](image)

Figure 8.13

As discussed earlier, money balances serve as a shock absorber or buffer stock, which temporarily absorbs unexpected variations in income (transitory income), until the portfolio of securities and consumer durable goods can be adjusted. Together with the shock which may come from unexpected changes in the nominal money supply. In order to measure this phenomenon we introduce, following Chow (1966), the money shock absorber variable, that is the deviation between the nominal money stock (CWM3) and its long run trend level (M*). Thus money deviation variable is
measured as:

\[ MDEV = \ln M_t - \ln M_t^* \]  

(8.4)

This is illustrated in figure 8.14. Until the turn of the century, the ratio is positive. Between 1902 and 1972 except for a short period, MDEV is negative. In other words, the actual money supply is less than the overall trend. This is reversed after 1973.

![Figure 8.14](image)

**8.8 Price Expectations**

The expected rate of change of price inflation reflects the opportunity cost of holding money. Early price expectations measurement used adaptive expectations, which were constructed using geometrically declining weights on the lagged values of past price inflation. However, by the early 1970s there was growing dissatisfaction with Friedman's adaptive expectations mechanism. Adaptive expectations implies that individuals will,
regardless of what else happens, hold to a learning curve derived from an earlier period in time, although this may not reflect at all, what is happening in the economy at that moment. It is very unlikely, that this is actually what happens. More likely is the idea that people select from alternative learning rules, depending upon the circumstances they find themselves in at any particular time, and the information available to them. In other words expectations are rational. The Rational Expectations hypothesis was originally pronounced by Muth (1961), but its application to macroeconomics and policy issues was pioneered by Sargent, Lucas, and Wallace in particular. The basis of the hypothesis is the proposition that anticipations are formed "rationally" or consistently by individuals, as optimal predictions based on available information. Therefore, individuals will not make systematic errors in forming their expectations of inflation, as in the adaptive expectations mechanisms, as adjustment is continuous. Consequently, there will be only transitory and random deviations between the actual and expected rates of inflation. According to Tatom (1983) if inflation expectations are unbiased, they can be measured by changes in the GDP deflator (RPD), as illustrated in figure 8.15, and this is the main measure we will use in this analysis.

Tatom (1983) also suggests energy and other raw material prices will affect velocity at least temporarily. These are measured here by the rate of growth of import prices (RPQD) as shown in figure 8.16.
Figure 8.15

Figure 8.16
If we recall from chapter three, Kami (1974) suggested that real money holdings are positively related to the real value of time. This is due to the fact that individuals and firms wish to save time when conducting their exchange activities. Kami's hypothesis is stated in the form of an inventory model of the demand for money, by assuming that cash withdrawal involves a cost in terms of goods and time, that is forgone earnings. He suggests that the elasticity of the demand for money with respect to real hourly earnings is larger than the elasticity of the demand for money with respect to property income or per capita hours worked. In order to consider this argument, we introduce the variable, WP, which is a real wage measure, the index of average weekly wage rates (W) to the price deflator (PD). This is illustrated in figure 8.17.

![Real Wages](image.png)
8.9 Financial Innovation

The final sub set of independent variables are those associated with financial innovation. By their very nature the sample size for these variables is very limited, although it has been possible to construct series for the post Second World War period. The first of these variables is the number of automatic teller machines (ATM) as illustrated in figure 8.18. The first ATM was introduced in the mid 1960s. After an initial period of steady growth, the late 1970s were characterised by a steady number of machines. However, after the introduction of the second generation machines in the early 1980s growth was very rapid.

![The number of Automatic Teller Machines (ATM's)](image)

Figure 8.18

The second financial innovation variable is the number of credit cards issued (CCARD) as shown in figure 8.19. These have risen rapidly since their introduction, apart from a slight decline in the early 1990s following the introduction of an annual charge.
The third financial innovation variable is the number of Building Society Share accounts per capita (BSSAPN) as illustrated in figure 8.20. This ratio has risen steadily until 1987, when it fell, before stabilising at a new plateau. Another financial innovation variable is the previous peak of the short run rate of interest (RSMAX). This is introduced to simulate the ratchet hypothesis put forward by Goldfeld (1973). It is illustrated in figure 8.21. Between 1955 and 1967 it is constant at 6.43%. It moves to a new level in 1968, remaining at this rate until 1972. Another new rate is established in 1973, where it remains for the next five years. RSMAX's maximum rate is established in the late 1970s at 16.0740, where it remains until the end of the sample period in 1991.
Figure 8.20

The number of Building Society Share Accounts per capita

Figure 8.21

The Previous Peak of the Short Run Rate of Interest
The final area concerns the financial innovations taking place in the stock market. These are measured in three forms, the real stock market price (RSMP), the Financial Times earnings yield (FTEY), and the ratio of short to long treasury bond yields (TLSR). The real stock market price is shown pictorially in figure 8.22. RSMP fell in the late 1950s, but recovered in the early 1960s, from whence it revolved around a constant mean until the early 1970s. A notable peak being in 1968. There was a dramatic fall in real stock market prices in 1973, and they remained at this low level until 1982, when a recovery began to take place. After 1987 RSMP was fairly constant until the end of the sample period.

Figure 8.22
The Financial Times Earnings Yield (FTEY) is shown in figure 8.23. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s FTEY is characterised for the most part by a downward trend, reaching an all time low in 1972. This is dramatically reversed into a maximum peak of 21.47 in 1973. The Financial Times Earning Yield then falls back modestly to a fairly constant plateau in the late 1970s. However, FTEY falls again in the early 1980s stabilising around a new mean for the remaining part of the decade. The ratio of long to short Treasury Bill yields (TLSR), is shown in figure 8.24. This variable peaks in the late 1950s, followed by a trough in the 1960's. A major peak is to be found in 1971 followed almost immediately by a trough in 1973. There are two further peaks in the mid 1970s, after which a decline takes place. TLSR is fairly stable in the 1980s, except for a trough in 1989.
8.10 The Theoretical Short Run Dynamic Model

The completion of the review of proposed regressors gives the opportunity to state the full short run model, including those long run regressors which also, it is believed, play a role in the short term. It can be stated in the following functional form.
V = f(RL, RS, ROWN, RFORG, (Y/PN)_P, CYCLE, YRGAP, 

interest rates wealth

(TNBFA/TFA), (ANA/L), PCMPT, (C/M),

financial sophistication monetisation

YSD, TG, TGDEF, SSG,

economic stability

STL, INV, MR, TAXR, MDEV,

G.D.P. and monetary shocks

RPD, RPQD, WP,

inflation and value of time

ATM, CCARD, BSSAPN, RSMAX, RSMF, FTEY, TLSR)

financial innovation

where V = velocity of circulation, RL = long term interest rate (consols (2.5%)), RS = short term interest rate (prime bank bill rate), ROWN = own rate of interest on money, RFORG = foreign portfolio term (German example), (Y/PN)_P = permanent income, CYCLE = the ratio of measured per capita real income to permanent per capita real income, YRGAP = difference between potential real output and actual real output, (TNBFA/TFA) = ratio of total non bank financial assets to total financial assets, (ANA/L) = ratio of the number of people working in nonagricultural pursuits to the total number of people employed, PCMPT = the proportion of population living in major towns and cities to total population, (C/M) = currency/money ratio, YSD = six year moving standard deviation of the percentage change in real income per head, TG = total government expenditure less interest payments on the national debt, divided by net national income, TGDEF = total government expenditure less interest payments on the national
debt and defence expenditure, divided by net national income, SSG = percentage of GDP spent on social services, defined as education, health, social security, and unemployment benefits, STL = the ratio of working days lost by strikes to the labour force employed, INVR = real inventories and work in progress, MR = real imports, TAXR = the basic rate of income tax, MDEV = deviation between the nominal money supply (M3) and its long run trend, RPQ = price inflation, RPQD = import price inflation, WP = real wages, ATM = the number of automatic teller machines, CCARD = the number of credit cards issued, BSSAPN = the number of building society share accounts per capita, R$ = the previous peak of the short run rate of interest, RSMP = the real stock market price, FTEY = Financial Times earnings yield, and TLSR = the ratio of short to long term treasury bond yields.

The last chapter established a long term relationship between velocity and a small number of explanatory variables. This chapter has been concerned with the construction of a short run dynamic model for use in the second step of the cointegration process. In undertaking this task, a number of possible additional determinants have been identified, and their definition, measurement, and economic behaviour in the United Kingdom has been discussed. The next task is to test this theoretical model with empirical work.

The list of explanatory variables is obviously based on earlier theorising to be found in the relevant literature and is intended to cover many considerations: price effects (rates of interest,
inflation, value of time); quantity effects (permanent income, cyclical phase); velocity miseasurement effects (measured versus permanent income); economic instability/uncertainty effects (income volatility); real and monetary shocks (strikes, tax change, unanticipated changes in money supply); structural effects (urbanisation, monetisation) and financial innovation. It is inevitable that in this process ad hoc theorising and approximate measurements cannot be avoided. The underlying individual optimising process takes place in a shifting environment where institutional, structural and technological developments play a role and may even affect the definition and thus measurement of the key variable, that is money.
Chapter 9

The Short Run Dynamic Relationship - Empirical Work

9.1 Introduction

With the theoretical short run dynamic model at hand, the next task is to test it using empirical work. Here both income and transactions velocity will be considered. First for the complete sample period 1870-1991 and later using two sub periods, that is 1870-1946, when velocity was falling, and 1950-1991, a period when velocity was rising. In estimating each relationship, the methodology suggested by Hendry, Pagan, and Sargan (1984) will be used, that is from the general to the specific. In other words, the starting point is the theoretical short term model with a generous lag structure, which is then simplified with the help of statistical tests, until an acceptable specific (parsimonious) model is derived. The main instrument in carrying out these tests is MICROFIT 3.0, with additional statistical computation using P.C. GIVE 6.0, and TSP, where necessary.

9.2 Additional Unit Root Tests

The theoretical short run dynamic model introduced additional variables that economic theory suggests affects the short term behaviour of velocity. In the strictest sense these variables should be the first differences of other I(1) variables which do not enter the cointegration regression. Therefore it is necessary to consider the time series properties of the proposed short run variables, and check their order of integration. A comprehensive diagnosis of all variables is found in appendix F. Here we concentrate on those variables which are not I(1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$a_3$</th>
<th>$t_s$</th>
<th>$t_{time}$</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>I(0)</th>
<th>I(1)</th>
<th>I(2)</th>
<th>I(3)</th>
<th>$k$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln CYCLE</td>
<td>0.68174 (4.71)</td>
<td>18.2004 (4.88)</td>
<td>27.2608 (6.65)</td>
<td>-4.7210 (1.96)</td>
<td>0.76272 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-7.3975 (2.8855)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln WED</td>
<td>3.9989 (4.71)</td>
<td>13.6095 (4.88)</td>
<td>20.4123 (8.497)</td>
<td>6.38917 (1.96)</td>
<td>1.9997 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-6.3836 (3.445)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln (W/P)</td>
<td>8.9407 (4.71)</td>
<td>7.2955 (4.88)</td>
<td>12.9587 (6.65)</td>
<td>-3.3905 (1.96)</td>
<td>2.9990 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-4.5900 (3.445)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln STL</td>
<td>1.3622 (4.71)</td>
<td>5.1642 (4.88)</td>
<td>7.6161 (6.65)</td>
<td>-1.3564 (1.96)</td>
<td>-1.1671 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-3.7172 (2.8855)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INR</td>
<td>0.048926 (4.71)</td>
<td>0.049935 (4.88)</td>
<td>7.12703 (6.65)</td>
<td>-0.16823 (1.96)</td>
<td>0.22119 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-7.6557 (2.8855)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln (LM/L)</td>
<td>6.1657 (4.71)</td>
<td>9.6947 (4.88)</td>
<td>7.5661 (6.65)</td>
<td>-2.3315 (1.96)</td>
<td>2.4795 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-3.0522 (3.445)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3.1865 (3.445)</td>
<td>-10.7649 (3.445)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln RM (1970-1991)</td>
<td>0.09481 (4.86)</td>
<td>3.0607 (5.13)</td>
<td>3.1280 (6.73)</td>
<td>0.36881 (1.96)</td>
<td>0.30812 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-0.20378 (2.9202)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.8800 (2.9202)</td>
<td>-5.8738 (2.9202)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln RGDP (1945-1991)</td>
<td>1.3217 (4.86)</td>
<td>4.0343 (5.13)</td>
<td>5.9616 (6.73)</td>
<td>-1.2800 (1.96)</td>
<td>1.1098 (1.96)</td>
<td>non-trended</td>
<td>-1.7947 (2.9256)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29433 (3.5084)</td>
<td>-3.4615 (2.9271)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Augmented Dickey Fuller statistics are reported in Table 9.1. Let us begin with the ratio of measured per captia real income to permanent per capita real income (CYCLE). The computed $\theta$, is greater than the corresponding critical value, so that the null hypothesis implying that the series contains a unit root cannot be accepted. The next step is to test $p = 1$ using critical values from the standard normal tables. In this case the null is rejected and we use a conventional $t$ statistic to decide whether to take $\beta$ to zero or not. Here we accept the null hypothesis that the series is stationary with no linear trend, but possibly with an intercept. We test the hypothesis using $s$ in a conventional manner. In this case an intercept is present. Thus we can conclude that $\ln CYCLE$ is an $I(0)$ variable.

A similar series of tests concludes that $\ln STL$, and $INVR$ are stationary series with no linear trend and no intercept. While $\ln PQR$, $\ln (W/P)$, and $\ln TQDEF$ are stationary series with a linear trend and an intercept. All these series being clearly $I(0)$. The financial innovation variables $\ln AIM$ and $\ln BSSAPN$ contain a unit root, and require differencing twice to achieve stationarity. The $\ln (LNA/L)$ series as discussed earlier in chapter seven, is a random walk about a non linear time trend and $I(2)$. Consequently all of the variables contained in Table 9.1 were dropped from the proposed short term model, which becomes:
$V = f(\text{RL, RS, ROWN, RFORC}, (\text{Y/PN})^\gamma, \text{YRGAP},$

- internet rates
- wealth
- (TNBFA/TFA),
- PCOMP, (C/M),

- financial sophistication
- monetization
- YSD, TG, SSG,
- MR, TAXR, MDEV,

- economic stability
- G.D.P. and monetary shocks

- RPD
- CCARD, RSMAX, RSMP, FIEY, TLSR

- inflation
- financial innovation

With the short run model established, the next task is estimation. As discussed earlier, the econometric methodology suggested by Hendry is used. The general theoretical model outlined above is adopted with a general lag structure, which is simplified with the help of statistical tests, until an acceptable or best possible model is derived.

9.3 The Full Sample Period 1870-1991

Initially we are concerned with income velocity for the whole period 1870-1991, the final specification is reported in equation (9.1).
Ordinary Least Squares

1874-1991

\[ \Delta V_{t} = -0.10309 + 0.51482 \Delta \left( \frac{Y}{P} \right)_{t} + 1.0054 \Delta \left( \frac{TNBFA}{TFA} \right)_{t-3} \]

(1.9793) (3.4641) (1.9920)

+ 0.18459 \Delta R_{t-1} + 0.20583 \Delta S_{t} - 0.20118 \Delta ROWN_{t}

(2.8397) (2.0651) (2.0195)

- 0.045818 \Delta T_{t} + 0.12796 \Delta FD_{t} + 0.50772 \Delta \left( \frac{C}{M} \right)_{t}

(2.7268) (1.8420) (5.4968)

- 0.039508 \Delta YSD_{t} - 0.028459 \Delta RES_{t-1} \]

(2.2249) (1.8183)

\[
R^{2} = 0.44382 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.044051
\]

n = 118

k = 10

D.W. = 1.7132 \quad [d_{d} = 1.335 \quad d_{p} = 1.765 \quad (4-d_{p}) = 2.235]

\[
\tau_{90} = [1.658] \quad \tau_{95} = [1.980]
\]

\[
P_{1}(1,106) = 3.0456 \quad [3.94]
\]

\[
P_{1}(1,106) = 7.2932 \quad [3.94]
\]

\[
\chi^{2} = 4.0343 \quad [5.991]
\]

\[
P_{1}(1,116) = 3.5817 \quad [3.92]
\]

Interest rates are represented by the long term rate lagged one period, and the contemporaneous values of short term and own rate of interest of on money. Wealth is portrayed by permanent income. Financial sophistication is symbolized by total non bank financial assets to total financial assets lagged three years. Monetization is depicted by the currency money ratio. Economic stability is represented by the six year moving standard deviation of the percentage change in real per capita income, and the ratio of total government expenditure, less interest payments on the national debt divided by net national income. Price expectations are depicted by the rate of growth of the GDP price deflator. Finally, the lagged residuals from the long term model are introduced as an error correction mechanism. Coefficients are
of the correct sign. All parameters are significantly different from zero at the 95% confidence level, except, \( \Delta P_{dt} \), and \( R E S_{-1} \), which are accepted at the 90% confidence level. It is interesting to note that the coefficients on \( ARS_t \) and \( AROWN_t \) are almost equal but of the opposite sign. The Durbin Watson statistic suggests no autocorrelation, and this is confirmed by the Lagrange multiplier test of residual serial correlation, \( (F_1) \). Jarrque - Bera's test of the normality of regression residuals \( (\chi^2) \), indicates that this is not a problem. \( F_3 \), the test for heteroscedasticity, is computed as 3.5817, less than the critical value of 3.92. This suggests that the residuals are homoscedastic. However, the estimated equation fails Ramsey's RESET test of functional form \( (F_2) \), which suggests misspecification. Another test for misspecification is the differencing test suggested by Plosser, Schwert and White (1982). Breusch and Godfrey (1986) have shown that this can be calculated as a variable addition test. The supplementary variables being constructed from the existing regressors by adding the observation lagged one period to the observation lead forward one period. The test then amounts to an F test for the joint significance of the additional regressors. In this case the differencing test is calculated as \( F(11,91) = 8.8407 \), and with a corresponding critical value of 1.89, the early suggestion of misspecification is maintained. The more sophisticated and detailed RESET tests computed by P.C. GIVE 6.0 suggest that \( ATG_t \) and \( AP_{dt} \) are the two candidates which cause the misspecification problem. However, as will be revealed later in our discussion, this is not the main problem with full sample dynamic equations.
An $R^2$ of 0.44382 suggests an average fit. Nonetheless, a plot of residuals and standard error bands, (figure 9.1), reveals a number of outliers.

The most notable being as follows; 1919 and 1921 a little after the end of the First World War, when income velocity declined rapidly and a period of major disinflation took place; 1948 soon after cessation of hostilities after the Second World War and the beginning of reconstruction; 1970 and 1975, a period of rapid inflation; 1988, a period of rapid financial innovative change. In an attempt to account for these outliers, dummy variables were introduced, the revised empirical results are shown in equation (9.2).
Ordinary Least Squares

1874-1991

\[ AVL_t = -0.086417 + 0.43948 \Delta(Y/PN)_t + 0.94463 \Delta(TNBFA/TFA)_{t-1} \]
\[ (1.8927) \quad (3.2663) \]

\[ + 0.16177 ARL_{t-1} + 0.52949 ARS_{t} - 0.51751 AROWN_{t} \]
\[ (2.6449) \quad (3.0461) \quad (2.9969) \]

\[ - 0.053795 ATG_{t} + 0.112233 APD_{t} + 0.34376 A(C/M)_{t} \]
\[ (1.7064) \quad (3.0180) \]

\[ - 0.0068728 AYSD_{t} - 0.18526 D19 - 0.089843 D21 \]
\[ (4.3637) \quad (2.0877) \]

\[ + 0.12385 D48 - 0.085302 D70 + 0.082548 D75 \]
\[ (2.1832) \quad (1.8688) \]

\[ - 0.16370 D88 - 0.024617 RES_{t-1} \]
\[ (2.0638) \quad (1.7992) \]

\[ R^2 = 0.60511 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.037118 \]
\[ n = 115 \]
\[ k = 16 \]
\[ D.W. = 1.5053 \quad [d_p = 1.203 \quad d_k = 1.922] \]
\[ t_{lo} = [1.658] \]
\[ t_{re} = [1.980] \]

\[ F_{(1,110)} = 9.0252 \quad [3.94] \]
\[ F_{(1,110)} = 5.2955 \quad [3.94] \]
\[ F_{(2,109)} = 1.5604 \quad [5.991] \]
\[ F_{(1,116)} = 1.7567 \quad [3.93] \]

While all the dummies are significantly different from zero at the 90% confidence level, their introduction leads to serial correlation, and the parameter on AYSD, becomes insignificant. It could be argued that the debut of dummy variables picks up exogenous occurrences, which would have been explained by the unknown omitted variables, although this of course, could suggest mis-specification in the first place.

Finally, returning to the original equation, consideration is made of parameter stability. A plot of the cumulative sum of
recursive residuals statistic is shown in figure 9.2.

![Plot of Cumulative Sum of Recursive Residuals](image)

Figure 9.2

Neither of the critical boundaries is crossed, and the null hypothesis that the regression model is correctly specified is accepted. This suggests that there are no systematic changes in the regression coefficients. A plot of cumulative sum of squares of recursive residuals, together with a pair of straight lines representing the 5% critical values is illustrated in figure 9.3. Here, the critical boundary is violated just after the First World War, and again in 1964. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected, and we accept that there is a sudden departure from constancy of the estimated regression coefficients. In order to locate the problem, we examine recursive parameter and t statistic plots.
First, consider the plot of the coefficient on $\Delta(Y/PN)^e$, figure 9.4.
This clearly shows parameter instability in 1921, if one recalls, the time of the structural break discussed earlier. The associated recursive t statistic is shown in figure 9.5. This suggests that the permanent income parameter was not significantly different from zero before the point of fluctuation. The variation in the t statistic after this point should also be noted.

As well as parameter fluctuation in 1921, the parameter on the ratio of total non bank financial assets to total financial assets, lagged three periods, also shows instability in 1939 and 1967, as illustrated in figure 9.6.
The corresponding recursive t statistic, figure 9.7, is interesting because it suggests that the parameter on $\Delta(TNBFA/TFA)_t$, is only significantly different from zero at the 95% confidence level between 1939 and 1964, together with a small period at the end of the sample. Although for the most part, the null is rejected at the 90% significance level between 1965 and 1989.
Apart from the structural break in 1921, the parameter on $ΔR_{t-1}$ is relatively stable. This is not true, however, of the short-term and own rate of money interest rates, whose coefficients follow a similar pattern, see figures 9.8 and 9.9. Parameter instability being found in 1919, 1934, 1947, and 1987. Another issue which is alarming, is the fact that these parameters are of the incorrect sign between 1919 and 1986. Further anxiety is caused by the fact that the coefficients are only significantly different from zero, at any acceptable confidence level, after 1986, (see figures 9.10 and 9.11).
After the First World War, the parameter on ATGt is comparatively constant. However, this shrouds its significance, exceeding t_{95} for two short periods, 1914-1919, 1984-1991, and t_{90} in three minor periods, 1896-1900, 1905-1913, and 1951-1963, (see figure 9.12).

The price inflation parameter shows marked instability in 1919-1921 (disinflation) and 1972-1977 (rapid inflation), as illustrated in figure 9.13. For most of the sample period, the associated parameter is significantly different from zero at the 90% confidence level, as shown by a plot of the recursive t statistic in figure 9.14. However, there are notable exceptions, 1888-1898, 1911-1914, 1919-1920, 1933-1946, 1969-1978.

Figure 9.12

The price inflation parameter shows marked instability in 1919-1921 (disinflation) and 1972-1977 (rapid inflation), as illustrated in figure 9.13. For most of the sample period, the associated parameter is significantly different from zero at the 90% confidence level, as shown by a plot of the recursive t statistic in figure 9.14. However, there are notable exceptions, 1888-1898, 1911-1914, 1919-1920, 1933-1946, 1969-1978.
Figure 9.13

Conf. of NPD and its 2 S.E. bands based on recursive OLS

Figure 9.14

The recursive t statistic on price inflation
One of the most volatile coefficients is that on $\Delta(C/M)_t$, a plot of which is shown in figure 9.15. However, it is with dismay, that we find that this parameter is only significantly different from zero after 1973 (figure 9.16).

The parameter on the economic stability variable $\Delta YSD_t$ is fairly stable, apart from the 1921 structural break. Once again it is only significant for two short periods 1921-1923 and 1973-1991. This point being illustrated in figure 9.17.

Finally, consider the coefficient on the error correction mechanism term, $RES_{t-1}$, figure 9.18. This shows wide fluctuations, the parameter is significant with two periods of exception, 1890-1905, and 1970-1980.
Figure 9.16

Figure 9.17
The detailed investigation of each parameter revealed that most were unstable, and often not significantly different from zero when considered on a cumulative basis. It also disclosed two possible structural breaks 1921 and 1964. Indeed, a plot of the regression standard errors of the recursive estimation, figure 9.19, shows these breaks clearly, together with the fact that the equation's descriptive power diminishes over time.
However, there may be a general explanation to this problem. If one recalls, the specific model reported in equation (9.1) is derived from a general model, which is revised using Hendry's methodology. Nevertheless, this is for a specific sample period 1870-1991. Let us suppose for a moment that Keynes's view that velocity behaviour depends on the structure of banking, industrial practices, social habits, the distribution of income, and the effective cost of holding idle balances is correct. Assume also that these influences alter and change over time. In consequence, the selection of variables from the general model will depend upon the sample period chosen. This does not affect the long term relationship described in chapter seven, this remains intact, it is the more volatile short run fluctuations in velocity whose structure changes. Later, we will return to this issue, and attempt to construct a more robust relationship.
for a shorter sample period.

First, we must turn our attention to the alternative dependent variable, transactions velocity, and compare and contrast this with the results for income velocity. Once again, the initial starting point was the general model, which was revised using Hendry's methodology until an acceptable model was derived.

**Ordinary Least Squares**

1874-1991

\[
AV_{t} = 0.09038 + 0.40617 \Delta \left(\frac{Y}{PN}\right)_{t} + 2.2910 \Delta \left(\frac{TNBFA}{TFA}\right)_{t-3} + 0.15947 ARL_{t-1} + 0.36969 A\left(\frac{C}{M}\right)_{t} - 0.12118 RES_{t-1} \tag{9.3}
\]

\[
(2.6744) \quad (2.2596) \quad (3.7663) \quad (2.1892) \quad (3.5836) \quad (2.7441)
\]

\[R^{2} = 0.28030 \quad s.e. = 0.053096\]

\[n = 118 \quad k = 5\]

D.W. = 1.6589 \quad [d_{c} = 1.441 \quad d_{e} = 1.647 \quad (4-d_{0}) = 2.353]

\[t_{90} = 1.658 \quad t_{95} = 1.980\]

\[F_{1,106} = 3.9037 \quad F_{2}(1,106) = 1.2299 \quad \chi^{2}(2) = 81.7324 \quad F_{5}(1,116) = 5.2230\]

This is a much simpler model than its income velocity counterpart. It consists of just permanent income, the total non-bank financial assets to total financial assets ratio lagged three years, the long term interest rate lagged on year, the currency money ratio, and the error correction term.

Unfortunately, there is one major problem with this equation, which was also a conundrum for all full sample transactions velocity equations considered. The Jarque - Bera's test of the
normality of regression residuals fails. The consequence of this one problem, is that it is not possible to assess the statistical reliability of the classical tests reported above, because they are based on normal distributions. A plot of residuals and standard error bands, figure 9.20, traces the normality problem to the major outliers in 1987 and 1989. A problem caused by major fluctuations in the transactions velocity variable itself, at the end of the sample period.

One solution to the problem, is the introduction of dummy variables for 1987 and 1989, which gives the following results.
Ordinary Least Squares
1874-1991

\[
\Delta V_t = 0.080297 + 0.34782 \Delta (Y/PN)_t + 2.1824 \Delta (TNBFA/TFA)_{t-3} \\
+ 0.17362 \Delta RL_{t-1} + 0.36111 \Delta (C/M)_t + 0.23772 D87 \\
- 0.19622 D89 - 0.10748 RES_{t-1} \\
(2.7983) (2.2714) (4.2414) (2.8178) (3.7802) (5.0382) (4.0500) (2.8680) 
\]

\[R^2 = 0.48564 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.044887\]
\[n = 118 \quad k = 7\]
\[D.W. = 1.7067 \quad [d_e = 1.400 \quad d_p = 1.693 \quad (4-d_p) = 2.307]\]
\[t_{90} = [1.658] \quad t_{95} = [1.98]\]
\[F(1,109) = 2.8362 \quad [3.94]\]
\[F(1,109) = 0.0059706 \quad [3.94]\]
\[x^2(2) = 0.91808 \quad [5.991]\]
\[F(1,116) = 0.42609 \quad [3.93]\]

The introduction of the dummy variables solves the normality problem, and the other statistical tests do not reveal any further problems. Given the fact that the normality problem was due to outliers in the transactions velocity variable, it could be argued, following Arestis and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal (1994, p.421), and Holden and Perman (1994, p.107), that these outliers should be captured by dummies in the Johansen procedure, when the long term vector was estimated. Attempts to carry out this procedure, in order to surpass the normality problem in the dynamic equation proved fruitless in this case.

While equation (9.4) proved to be an excellent specification, the entry of the dummy variables late in the sample period caused problems with the computation of the CUSUM and associated statistics. In order to solve this problem, and the original normality one, the equation less dummies was reestimated for the period 1870-1986.
**Ordinary Least Squares**  
1874-1986

\[
AVZ_t = 0.076685 + 0.34738 (Y/PN)_t^t + 2.1602 (TMBFA/TFA)_{t-3} + 0.17107 ARL_{t-1} + 0.34045 (C/M)_t - 0.10247 RES_{t-1} 
\text{(2.6017)} \text{(2.2465)} \text{(4.1588)} \text{(2.6878)} \text{(3.4133)} \text{(2.6614)} 
\]

\[
= 0.30095 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.045169 
\]

\[
n = 113 
\]

\[
k = 5 
\]

\[
D.W. = 1.6918 \quad [d_L = 1.441 \ d_U = 1.647 \ (4-d_U) = 2.353] 
\text{t}_{pp} = [1.658] 
\text{t}_{95} = [1.980] 
\]

\[
F_1(1,106) = 2.8676 \ [3.94] 
F_2(1,106) = 0.003199 \ [3.94] 
\chi^2(2) = 0.65012 \ [5.991] 
F_3(1,111) = 0.48097 \ [3.93] 
F_4(5,107) = 9.5529 \ [2.30] 
\]

The overall predictive performance of this equation is poor, with an \( R^2 \) of 0.30095. Nevertheless, all statistical tests are acceptable, except Chow's predictive failure statistic \( F_4 \), a test of the adequacy of predictions. This is not surprising given the discussion of outliers in the period 1987-1991.

However, a plot of cumulative sum of squares of recursive residuals, figure 9.21, shows that the lower critical boundary is crossed on two occasions. The breeches taking place between 1939-1951 and 1960-1970.
Consideration of each recursive coefficient reveals much parameter instability. Plots of corresponding recursive t statistics uncovers the fact that the majority of parameters are not significantly different from zero for the whole sample period.

The recursive coefficient on permanent income, figure 9.22, shows much variation. While its matching recursive t statistic reveals that it is only significant for a short period at the end of the nineteenth century and after 1920, figure 9.23.
Figure 9.22

Recursive coefficient on permanent income

Figure 9.23

Recursive t statistic of delta permanent income
Prior to the end of the Second World War, much variation is found in the parameter on $\Delta (TNBFA/TFA)_{t-3}$, figure 9.24. The complementary recursive t statistic, figure 9.25, shows the parameter is not, for the most part, significant until after 1936. Before 1933 the recursive parameter on $ARL_{t-1}$ is volatile, after which it is fairly stable, although some variation is present, figure 9.26. The correlative recursive t statistic, figure 9.27, suggests that the parameter is only significant between 1898-1904, 1919-1923, and 1936-1991. A plot of the recursive coefficient on $\Delta (C/M)_t$, figure 9.28, shows much variation until 1922. The following twenty years reveals some stability, which is followed by a trough, after which some constancy is restored. In 1970 there is a sharp increase in parameter size, succeeding mild variation. The recursive t statistic reveals that significance only occurs after 1970, figure 9.29. Finally, the recursive coefficient on the lagged error correction mechanism variable, figure 9.30, indicates little variation until the commencement of the Second World War, after which a steep fall takes place until 1970, when mild variation ensues. The associated recursive t statistic indicates significance for virtually the whole sample period, figure 9.31.
Figure 9.24

Figure 9.25
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Figure 9.26

The recursive coefficient on H(−1)

Figure 9.27

Recursive t statistic on delta H(−1)
Figure 9.28

Recursion Coefficient on Delta (C/M)

Figure 9.29

Recursion t statistic on delta (C/M)
Figure 9.30

Recursive Coefficient on the lagged error correction mechanism variable

Figure 9.31

Recursive t statistic on lagged the error correction term
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The overall fit of equation (9.5) is very poor. A plot of the regression standard errors of the recursive equation, figure 9.32, indicates that performance is fairly constant until the final thirty year period, when some deterioration takes place.

Attempts at finding an acceptable transactions velocity specification for the whole period revealed a number of problems, notably that concerning normality. It also disclosed that a different sub set of variables play a role when compared with the income velocity specification.

However, the results do not detract from our earlier tentative conclusion, that the relevant players in the short run velocity equation change over time, according to contemporaneous circumstances. In order to consider this point further, let us consider two sub samples, 1870-1946, a period of falling
velocity, and 1950-1991 a time of rising velocity.

9.4 Sub Sample 1870-1946 - Falling Velocity

Let us commence with income velocity for the first sub sample. Once again the initial starting point was the general short run specification, which was simplified using the Hendry methodology.

**Ordinary Least Squares**

1873-1946

\[
\Delta \ln v_t = -0.29282 + 0.83870 \Delta (Y/PN)_{t-1} + 0.30365 \Delta R_{t-1} - 0.081923 \text{ RES}_{t-1}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(3.5906) & \quad (5.4783) & \quad (2.9998) \\
(9.6) & \quad (3.3496)
\end{align*}
\]

\[R^2 = 0.36857 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.042268\]

\[n = 74 \quad k = 3\]

\[D.W. = 2.1642 \quad [d_0 = 1.395 \quad d_p = 1.557 \quad (4-d_p) = 2.443]\]

\[t_{50} = [1.671] \quad t_{95} = [2.000]\]

\[\begin{align*}
F_1(1,69) &= 1.3951 \quad [3.98] \\
F_2(1,69) &= 3.0387 \quad [3.98] \\
F'(2) &= 1.8545 \quad [5.991] \\
F_1(1,72) &= 19.1813 \quad [3.98] \\
F_3(45,70) &= 2.4634 \quad [1.55] \\
F_5(4,111) &= 2.4875 \quad [2.46]
\end{align*}\]

Apart from the error correction term and the intercept, equation (9.6), has just two regressors, permanent income and the long term interest rate lagged one period. An \(R^2\) of 0.36857 does not suggest a very good fit. However, all the basic statistical tests are passed, except \(F_1\) the heteroscedasticity test, and the plot of cumulative sum of squares of recursive residuals. The lower critical boundary being crossed between 1908 and 1919, see figure 9.33. This is confirmed by the Chow test of stability of the regression coefficients, \(F_5(4,111) = 2.4875 [2.46]\).
It is also interesting to note, that Chow's second test of adequacy of predictions also fails, $F_4(45, 70) = 2.4634$ [1.55]. Confirming the argument that a specification for one sub period does not necessarily perform well in another period. This is also illustrated by a plot of actual and forecast values from 1947 onwards, figure 9.34.
The problems outlined above, except the forecast errors, are resolved by the introduction of dummy variables for 1919 and 1921, as shown in equation (9.7).

**Ordinary Least Squares**

1873-1946

\[
\Delta V_t = -0.24270 + 0.62399 \Delta (Y/PN)_{t-1} + 0.32562 \Delta R_{t-1} - 0.12354 D19 - 0.15193 D21 - 0.069076 RES_{t-1}
\]

\[ (3.5906) \quad (5.4783) \quad (2.9998) \quad (3.2508) \quad (3.6752) \quad (3.1935) \]

\[ R^2 = 0.51463 \quad s.e. = 0.037058 \]

\[ n = 74 \quad k = 5 \]

D.W. = 1.6517 \[ d_k = 1.340 \quad d_p = 1.617 \quad (4-d_p) = 2.383 \]

\[ t_{90} = [1.671] \quad t_{95} = [2.000] \]

\[ F_1(1,67) = 1.5055 \quad F_2(1,69) = 0.82563 \quad F_3(2) = 0.14759 \quad F_4(1,72) = 0.80883 \quad F_5(45,68) = 3.0246 \]

---

**Figure 9.34**

The plot shows a comparison of actual and static forecasts for the period 1873-1946, with a focus on the data years 1919 and 1921.
Turning our attention to transactions velocity, the following results are derived:

**Ordinary Least Squares**

1873-1946

\[
\Delta V_t = 0.19811 + 0.52082 \Delta (Y/PN)_t + 0.20259 \Delta RL_{t-1} - 0.29313 \text{ RES}_{t-1}
\]

(4.4995) (3.6829) (2.1922) (4.7919)

\[R^2 = 0.2811 \quad \text{s.e.} = 0.038699\]

\[n = 74 \quad k = 3\]

\[D.W. = 1.6968 \quad [d_u = 1.395 \quad d_s = 1.557 \quad (4 - d_u) = 2.443]\]

\[t_{sw} = [1.671] \quad t_{rs} = [2.000]\]

\[F(1,69) = 2.3278 [3.98] \quad F(1,69) = 6.4120 [3.98]\]

\[x^2(2) = 0.013781 [5.991] \quad F(1,72) = 2.8703 [3.98] \quad F(45,70) = 4.2053 [1.56]\]

\[F(4,111) = 2.8306 [2.46]\]

These are of equivalent specification, and equally as poor. The main statistical problem is functional form, as indicated by Ramsey's RESET test ($F_7$). Nevertheless, the CUSUM tests suggest that parameter stability is not a problem in this instance. However, this view is contradicted by the Chow test $F_5(4,111) = 2.8306 [2.46]$. Once again Chow's second test of adequacy of predictions fails, $F_4(45,70) = 4.2053 [1.56]$. This is illustrated by a plot of actual and forecast values (figure 9.35).
An attempt to correct the functional form problem using a dummy variable in 1921, the point of structural break, identified earlier, just resolves this problem, although introduced the additional problem of autocorrelation. This is reported in equation (9.9).

Figure 9.35
Ordinary Least Squares

1873-1946

\[ AV_t = 0.19596 + 0.38903 \Delta(Y/PN)_t + 0.26040 \Delta R_{L_{t-1}} \]
\[ - 0.12835 D_{21} - 0.28467 RES_{t-1} \]
\[ (4.7318) \quad (2.7930) \quad (2.9328) \quad (3.1842) \quad (4.9430) \]

\[ R^2 = 0.36413 \quad s.e. = 0.036396 \]
\[ n = 74 \]
\[ k = 4 \]
\[ D.W. = 1.4276 \quad [d_1 = 1.368 \quad d_2 = 1.587] \]
\[ t^{90} = [1.671] \]
\[ t_{95} = [2.000] \]
\[ F_1(1,69) = 10.2037 \quad [3.98] \]
\[ F_2(1,69) = 3.9403 \quad [3.98] \]
\[ X^2(2) = 0.48718 \quad [5.991] \]
\[ F_3(1,72) = 0.15810 \quad [3.98] \]
\[ F_4(45,70) = 4.6891 \quad [1.56] \]

9.5 Sub Sample 1950-1991 - Rising Velocity

Let us turn to the second sub-period. Once again the general to specific methodology is used. The final specification is as follows:

Ordinary Least Squares

1950-1991

\[ AV_t = -0.063045 + 0.20269 \Delta R_{S_t} - 0.20911 \Delta R_{WN_t} \]
\[ + 0.30992 \Delta T_{AXR_t} + 0.74867 \Delta (C/M)_t - 0.068381 \Delta Y_{SD_t} \]
\[ (1.5071) \quad (3.3172) \quad (3.3999) \quad (2.7930) \quad (9.7716) \quad (2.6913) \]
\[ + 0.24250 \Delta P_{DS_t} - 0.0087244 \Delta R_{FORG_{t-1}} - 0.024220 RES_{t-1} \]
\[ (2.7294) \quad (1.9430) \quad (1.8614) \]

\[ R^2 = 0.85175 \quad s.e. = 0.026250 \]
\[ n = 42 \]
\[ k = 8 \]
\[ D.W. = 2.0474 \quad [d_1 = 0.974 \quad d_2 = 1.768 \quad (4-d^2) = 2.232] \]
\[ t^{90} = [1.684] \]
\[ t_{95} = [2.021] \]
\[ F_1(1,32) = 0.15277 \quad [4.15] \]
\[ F_2(1,32) = 0.029262 \quad [4.15] \]
\[ X^2(2) = 1.6842 \quad [5.991] \]
\[ F_3(1,40) = 1.8884 \quad [4.08] \]
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It consists of short term and "own rate" interest rates. The basic income tax rate. An economic stability term and price inflation. Together with a foreign portfolio term based on the German interest rate lagged one period. This is an excellent equation, all parameters, except the intercept, are of the correct sign, and significantly different from zero. Tests for serial correlation, functional form, normality and heteroscedasticity are all passed. The null hypothesis is accepted for both CUSUM tests. Thus it is possible to conclude that the regression model is correctly specified, and that there are no systematic changes in the regression coefficients (see figures 9.36 and 9.37.

![Plot of Cumulative Sum of Recursive Residuals](image)

**Figure 9.36**
The equations exemplary performance is reinforced by a plot of actual and fitted values, figure 9.38, and residuals and standard error bands, figure 9.39. Indeed, over 85% of the variation in income velocity is explained by this specification.
Figure 9.38

Figure 9.39
Further analysis of the sub period 1950-1991 continues with consideration of transactions velocity. Simplification of the general model using statistical tests, gives the following equation.

**Ordinary Least Squares**

**1950-1991**

\[
\Delta V_t = 0.20535 + 0.61350 \Delta \text{TA}_{X_t} + 0.51743 \Delta (C/M)_t \\
- 0.015951 \Delta \text{RFORG}_{t-1} - 0.19161 \text{RES}_{t-1}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(2.4318) & & (2.4327) & & (3.0175) \\
(1.5869) & & (1.9996) & & (9.11)
\end{align*}
\]

\[s.e = 0.062641 \]

\[n = 42 \]

\[k = 4 \]

\[D.W. = 1.8693 \quad [d_l = 1.098 \quad d_u = 1.518 \quad (4-d_p) = 2.482] \]

\[t_{90} = [1.684] \]

\[t_{95} = [2.021] \]

\[F(1,36) = 0.17266 \quad [4.11] \]

\[F(1,36) = 1.5537 \quad [4.11] \]

\[x^2(2) = 54.6998 \quad [5.991] \]

\[F(1,40) = 0.18302 \quad [4.08] \]

This is composed of the basic income tax rate, the currency money ratio, the foreign portfolio variable lagged once and the error correction term. Unfortunately, the normality problem invalidates the majority of diagnostic tests. As discussed earlier, this is caused by the outliers in 1987 and 1989, see figure 9.40, and is solved using dummies.
The revised results become:

**Ordinary Least Squares**

1950-1991

\[
\Delta V_t = 0.16013 + 0.53272 \Delta T A X R_t + 0.58876 \Delta (C/M)_t - 0.010524 ARFORG_{t-1} + 0.25052 D87 - 0.14132 D89 - 0.14150 RE_{t-1} \\
\text{s.e.} = 0.04314 \\
n = 42 \\
k = 6 \\
D.W. = 2.4552 \ [d_\ell = 1.065 \ d_u = 1.643 \ (4-d_\ell) = 2.357] \\
F_{1,40} = 1.4571 \ [4.08] \\
F_{3,1} = 0.73869 \ [0.04314] \\
F_{3,14} = 0.16849 [5.991] \\
P_{1,14} = 1.4571 [4.08]
\]

All but one of the statistical tests are passed. The exception
is the parameter on ARFORGt-1 which is just outside being significantly different from zero at the 90% confidence level. The entry of dummy variables late in the sample makes the computation of the CUSUM tests difficult. An alternative solution to the original normality problem is to curtail the sample period in 1986. This gives the following results:

Ordinary Least Squares

1950-1986

\[ AVZ_t = 0.16990 + 0.58443 \Delta TAXR_t + 0.53855 \Delta (C/M)_t \]
\[ - 0.011333 \Delta RFORG_{t-1} - 0.15086 RES_t - 1 (9.13) \]
\[ (2.7243) (3.3535) (3.91494) \]
\[ - 0.15086 \]
\[ (9.13) \]
\[ (1.6220) (2.1427) \]

\[ R^2 = 0.57365 \]
\[ s.e. = 0.042569 \]
\[ n = 37 \]
\[ k = 4 \]
\[ D.W. = 2.5357 \]  
\[ [d_L=1.058 \ d_U=1.514 \ (4-d_L)=2.486 \ (4-d_U)=2.942] \]
\[ t_{50} = [1.684] \]
\[ t_{95} = [2.021] \]
\[ F(1,31) = 3.4464 \]  
\[ [4.16] \]
\[ F(1,31) = 0.036983 \]  
\[ [4.16] \]
\[ F(2) = 0.047095 \]  
\[ [5.991] \]
\[ F(1,35) = 0.77062 \]  
\[ [4.12] \]
\[ F(5,32) = 9.6235 \]  
\[ [2.51] \]

An \( R^2 \) of 0.57365 suggests a reasonable fit. The Durbin Watson statistic lies between (4-\( d_L \)) and (4-\( d_U \)), and therefore is inconclusive. However, the Lagrange Multiplier test suggests that autocorrelation is not a problem. With the exception of the marginal t statistic associated with ARFORGt, and the predictive failure test, which is not surprising given the outliers in 1987 and 1989, all other tests are passed. These include the CUSUM tests, illustrated in figures 9.41 and 9.42.
Figure 9.41

Plot of Cumulative Sum of Recursive Residuals

The straight lines represent critical bounds at 5% significance level

Figure 9.42

Plot of Cumulative Sum of Squares of Recursive Residuals

The straight lines represent critical bounds at 5% significance level
While a fairly good fit is indicated, there are still a number of outliers in 1967, 1976, and 1977, as illustrated in a plot of residuals and standard error bands, (figure 9.43).

\[ \text{Plot of Residuals and Standard Error Bands} \]

![Plot of Residuals and Standard Error Bands](image)

**Figure 9.43**

### 9.6 Review of Empirical Evidence

With the empirical work completed, it is possible to ascertain how well the theoretical model performs when confronted with the data. Just before we commence this task, it is useful to restate the two long run Johansen vectors, as these are the underlying foundation of the short term model.

For income velocity:

\[ \ln \left( V_t \right) = 0.44685 \ln \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)_t + 0.11847 R_{L_t} - 0.26820 R_{WN_t} + 6.97990 \ln \left( \frac{TNBFA}{TFA} \right)_t \]
and transactions velocity;

\[ \ln V_{2t} = 0.2520 \ln \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)_t + 0.030 \RL_t - 0.0455 \ROWN_t + 3.069 \ln \left( \frac{TNF/FA}{TFA} \right)_t + 0.0465 \ln (C/M)_t - 0.1041 \ln \text{BANK}_t \]

The key short run equations are reported in Table 9.2. We will deal with each category of variable in turn, starting with interest rates.

The long term interest rate is one of the components of the Johansen vector, and thus has an intrinsic role in all the dynamic equations. Its lagged first difference also plays a part in the full sample, and falling velocity sub period. However, there is no direct function for long term interest rates in the post second world war dynamic relationships. If we recall, one of the main concerns of earlier empirical work, was the elasticity of velocity with respect to interest rates. The liquidity trap hypothesis being closely related to the proposition that the relationship between velocity and the rate of interest can be expected to be unstable over time. Nevertheless, there is no support for this from the empirical results. There is little variation in parameter sign. Indeed, the earlier plots of cumulative regression parameters, for all interest rates, proved to be the most stable of those investigated. The short term interest rate and the "own" rate of interest on money, appear only in the income velocity equations, for the full, and rising velocity sub period. It is interesting to note that the corresponding parameters on ARS and AROWN are almost equal but opposite in sign. The foreign interest rate
Table 9.2 Key Short Run Dynamic Equations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent:</strong></td>
<td>AVI</td>
<td>AV2</td>
<td>AVI</td>
<td>AV2</td>
<td>AVI</td>
<td>AV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.10309 (1.9793)</td>
<td>0.060297 (2.7983)</td>
<td>-0.29282 (3.5906)</td>
<td>0.19811 (4.6995)</td>
<td>-0.065045 (1.5071)</td>
<td>0.16013 (2.7210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR1</td>
<td>0.18459 (2.6197)</td>
<td>0.17762 (2.6176)</td>
<td>0.30363 (2.9996)</td>
<td>0.20259 (3.1922)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR2</td>
<td>0.20583 (2.0651)</td>
<td>0.20269 (3.172)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocorr</td>
<td>-0.20118 (2.0195)</td>
<td>-0.20911 (3.3999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR3</td>
<td>-0.0087244 (1.9630)</td>
<td>-0.010524 (1.5022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT(V/IV)</td>
<td>0.51482 (2.4661)</td>
<td>0.34782 (2.7714)</td>
<td>0.83870 (5.4783)</td>
<td>0.52862 (3.6429)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG</td>
<td>1.0054 (1.9920)</td>
<td>2.1824 (4.2414)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>0.50772 (5.4966)</td>
<td>0.36111 (3.7602)</td>
<td>0.76967 (5.7716)</td>
<td>0.58976 (4.6599)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>-0.039508 (2.2497)</td>
<td>-0.066381 (2.5911)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX</td>
<td>-0.045818 (2.7268)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYR</td>
<td>0.2796 (1.8482)</td>
<td>0.24350 (2.7294)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.30992 (2.7930)</td>
<td>0.53272 (3.6093)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMCR</td>
<td>0.12796 (1.8420)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>0.23772 (5.0382)</td>
<td>0.25052 (5.4117)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR9</td>
<td>-0.19622 (4.6020)</td>
<td>-0.14132 (2.8813)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM</td>
<td>-0.028469 (1.8183)</td>
<td>-0.10768 (2.8680)</td>
<td>-0.064923 (3.9219)</td>
<td>-0.29313 (4.7819)</td>
<td>-0.024220 (1.8814)</td>
<td>-0.14150 (2.1193)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.W.</td>
<td>1.7132</td>
<td>1.7067</td>
<td>2.1443</td>
<td>1.9688</td>
<td>2.0674</td>
<td>2.4552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d_d</td>
<td>1.765</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td>1.557</td>
<td>1.557</td>
<td>1.768</td>
<td>1.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-d_d)</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>2.307</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>2.232</td>
<td>2.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.e.</td>
<td>0.044051</td>
<td>0.044887</td>
<td>0.042288</td>
<td>0.038699</td>
<td>0.026250</td>
<td>0.04214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t_m</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>1.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t_m</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>2.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(1.106)</td>
<td>(1.109)</td>
<td>(1.69)</td>
<td>(1.69)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3452</td>
<td>1.3562</td>
<td>1.3951</td>
<td>1.3758</td>
<td>0.9727</td>
<td>2.5321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0097076</td>
<td>0.2487</td>
<td>0.0968</td>
<td>0.1542</td>
<td>0.1010</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z(2)</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
<td>0.91808</td>
<td>1.0254</td>
<td>0.03781</td>
<td>1.6842</td>
<td>0.16849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[5.991]</td>
<td>[5.991]</td>
<td>[5.991]</td>
<td>[5.991]</td>
<td>[5.991]</td>
<td>[5.991]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(1.116)</td>
<td>(1.116)</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5417</td>
<td>0.49599</td>
<td>1.1833</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
<td>1.8898</td>
<td>1.4971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equation:** 9.3
deviation term is the final variable in this group. This enters both income and transactions velocity equations for the post second world war sub period, although there is some doubt about its significance in the transactions velocity specification. Although the overall influence of this variable in velocity behaviour appears limited.

The second group of regressors are those associated with wealth. Permanent income plays a role in both long run vectors, and all but the post 1950 dynamic equations. In consequence the growth of expected income would appear to have no role in the post war period. The GDP gap, the difference between potential and actual real output, is not significant in any equation.

A proxy for financial sophistication, (TNBFA/TFA), a measure for financial development plays a significant role in both Johansen vectors. It is also interesting to note that the growth rate of this variable lagged three years is to be found in the full sample dynamic equations.

The first monetization variable, the currency money ratio is found in the transactions velocity vector, but not the income velocity one. It also appears in both sub samples. The alternative monetization variable, that is the urbanization of the population, is not significant in any equation.

The economic stability variable only appears in the income velocity equations, and even then is omitted from the 1870-1946
sub period. The alternative measure, TG, is only to be found in the full sample income velocity specification. However, with its negative sign, it is representing the stabilizing role played by governments as opposed to economic stability per se.

Apart from ATAXR which plays a role in the post war sub samples, none of the other GDP or monetary impactors are significant. Price expectations too is limited to the income velocity specifications, and then only for the 1870-1991 and 1950-1990 samples.

None of the financial innovation variables are significantly different from zero in any chosen sample period. This was perhaps not surprising, because by their very nature the number of observations was very small, in one case just twenty five data points. The statistical techniques used in this thesis are concerned with the long run. This led to the conclusion that it was not possible to test these relationships with velocity comprehensively here. An alternative would have been the use of quarterly data. This for some variables was not available, but interpolation techniques could have been employed.

An overall observation, was the fact that the final models of income and transactions velocity are different. Furthermore, the transactions velocity relationships performed less well than their income velocity counterparts. This may be due to unknown omitted variables. As past literature has concentrated on income velocity, and thus those factors which are concerned with value
added. While transactions velocity includes intermediate transactions and second hand goods, will be affected by vertical integration of firms, and technological changes that lengthen or shorten the production process from raw material to final product.

The general statistical performance of the short run equations was good. Once the outliers in transactions velocity for 1987 and 1989 were corrected using dummies, the earlier normality problem was corrected. However, the results for the full sample period mark a major problem. The majority of parameters contained in these equations are extremely unstable, and recursive t statistics tests reveal that their significance is very much dependent on the sample period chosen.

As discussed earlier, one possible explanation for this fact, is that while there is a stable long term relationship, between velocity and a few variables, as described by the Johansen vector, the short run relationship is volatile, and depends on contemporaneous structural and institutional influences. Thus while it is possible to build short sub sample dynamic models, this is not possible for the whole sample period.

Nevertheless, the proposed short run model presented at the beginning of this chapter is not correct. With the hindsight of empirical work, income velocity can be rewritten as;
Comparison with earlier literature is not straightforward, as much of this was carried out in levels rather than first differences. The most comprehensive work on the income velocity long run relationship is found in Siklos (1993) where similar results, using a less sophisticated model are to be found. In terms of the short run relationship, Bordo and Joung (1990) carried out some empirical work using first differences, and it is interesting to compare this with our own results. Table 9.3 shows this empirical work, together with their earlier work in levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3 Institutional Variables in the long-run velocity function (Codrington-Court technique)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolke and Tsou (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Sample Period 1776-1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$ Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14 0.996 (0.095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15 -0.396 (-0.334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.16 1.388 (4.334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.17 1.007 (3.835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolke and Tsou (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Sample Period 1876-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$ Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18 -0.902 (-0.875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.19 -1.497 (-0.841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary Least Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.20 -0.005 (-0.762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.21 -0.005 (1.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.22 -0.004 (1.274)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Equations 9.14 to 9.16 are in levels for the complete sample period. Note that full sample is slightly less than our own. All these equations perform well, although some parameters are not significantly different from zero. However, the general criticism of using the Cochrane-Orcutt technique to correct severe autocorrelation, discussed earlier, remains. A more direct comparison with our own work is found in equations 9.20 to 9.22. These equations perform less well than our own full sample income velocity specification. The best R² = 0.352 (9.21) compares with 0.44382 of equation 9.1. The parameters on $\Delta(Y/\text{PN})^p$ are remarkably similar in size to the 0.51482 of our equation. However, much variation is found in the size of other parameters.

Table 9.4 reports Bordo and Jonung's (1987) results for both falling velocity (1876-1946) and rising velocity (1947-1974). All these results are in levels, making comparison difficult. Indeed, in terms of goodness of fit, all these equations perform better than our own, particularly for the 1870-1946 sub period. Nevertheless, the methodology problems outlined above still give concern.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>ln(Y/N0)</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>ln Cycle</th>
<th>ln(LM/L)</th>
<th>ln(C/Y)</th>
<th>ln(DNBR/TVR)</th>
<th>lnYED</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.710</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 Institutional Variables in the long-run velocity function (Chowrasia-Gupta technique)

United Kingdom

Boards and Jewelry (1987)

Falling Velocity 1976-1946

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>ln(Y/N0)</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>ln Cycle</th>
<th>ln(LM/L)</th>
<th>ln(C/Y)</th>
<th>ln(DNBR/TVR)</th>
<th>lnYED</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.710</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the empirical work reviewed in this thesis, has reached two main conclusions. A long term relationship between a few variables exists. However, the short run dynamic relationships are volatile, have unstable parameters, and give poor results for the complete sample period. The statistical work using the sub period when velocity was falling (1870-1946) are very weak. Fairly satisfactory results are found with the post second world war period, 1950-1991, a time of rising velocity.
Chapter 10
Summary and conclusions

One of the key assumptions that turns the equation of exchange into a theory of the determination of the price level, is that the velocity of circulation is a constant, or at least a stable function of a few economic variables. Even a cursory look at the velocity data denies the fact that it is a constant. Keynes sees no reason to suggest constancy. In fact he believes that in periods of underemployment equilibrium velocity may be quite volatile. It will be determined by economic structure, which may include the state of technology and institutional arrangements. Friedman, on the other hand, argues that velocity data is not constant because of deviations between actual and desired velocity, together with errors of measurement. It is the investigation of these two contradicting views, which has been at the centre of this thesis.

It is discernible from the literature on the definition of velocity, that there was an early divergence into two schools of thought. The "motion" theorists believed that the velocity of circulation is a property of money, the mechanical movement of coins being exchanged from hand to hand. The "cash balance" theorists argued that the proportion of income held as money is not dependent on the properties of coins, but on individuals' actions governed by economic motives.
It is of critical importance to realize that the two alternative views of velocity are not the same empirically. Income velocity measures transactions in terms of the value-added by each sector of the economy. Each firm's value added is the value of its output minus the cost of the inputs that it purchased elsewhere. On the other hand, transactions velocity includes in its measure of transactions intermediate goods and the exchange of existing assets, in addition to payment for final goods and services. The transactions velocity will be affected by vertical integration of firms, which will reduce the number of transactions involved in a single income circuit. Furthermore, technological changes that lengthen or shorten the production process from raw materials to final product will also affect the number of transactions undertaken. This will not affect income velocity. The transactions version includes the purchase of existing assets, while the income version disregards these completely.

The measurement of velocity is not straightforward. It can be simply defined as the number of times a unit of money is transferred between economic agents in a given period of time, or the ratio of the value of goods and services to the stock of money. However, there are a number of different ways to measure both the numerator and denominator.
The problems associated with measuring transactions, the development of national income accounting and the development of the income version of the equation of exchange, are important milestones. Transactions velocity is put to one side, and income velocity forms the foundation for the major developments which later take place with Keynes's analysis. Therefore, it is usual in modern literature to only consider income velocity, while transactions velocity is dealt with in passing and then tends to be dismissed due to problems of measurement and lack of reliable statistical data. This thesis challenges this viewpoint, and constructs an original data series for a transactions measure for the period 1870-1991, which involves the use of over sixty variables and seven thousand observations. In consequence both income and transactions were available as the numerator in the velocity ratio.

There are at least four theoretical definitions of the money stock, and an even greater magnitude of official statistical measures. This leads to a lack of comprehensive data over long time periods. To overcome this problem, the updated data found in Capie and Webber (1985) were used. One major criticism of the official monetary definitions are the potential errors associated with the simple sum weighting scheme used to derive them. This gives the same weight to currency as money placed in a deposit account where interest is received. In terms of opportunity cost these have completely different characteristics. To surmount this problem, following Barnett (1983,1984), a number of divisia monetary aggregates were constructed.
Given recent advances in econometric methodology, it is possible to raise a number of objections to the manner in which earlier literature proceeded with their empirical work. The most comprehensive work on income velocity is conducted by Bordo and Jonung (1987), who correct severe positive autocorrelation using the Cochrane-Orcutt technique. Hendry and Mizon (1978) suggest that serial correlation in this context may be evidence of model mis-specification. Another problem is that it is now clear that many economic time series contain a unit root. It is argued that such series are best analyzed in first differences, rather than levels.

The concept of cointegration resolves many of these issues. Furthermore, it lends itself to testing the key economic arguments, as the model can be separated into long and short term elements. A review of earlier economic literature identified four types of velocity determinants in the long term: the traditional ones, wealth and interest rates; the institutional ones associated with monetization and financial development of the economic infrastructure. Empirical work found a long term relationship between income velocity and permanent income, a long-term interest rate, the own rate of interest on money, and a ratio of total non-bank financial assets to total financial assets, representing financial sophistication. A similar relationship was found between transactions velocity and these variables, together with the currency money ratio and the number of bank branches, which are both proxies for monetization. These results were in line with Friedman's view of a stable function.
of a few variables.

In addition to the four types already identified, an examination of the previous literature distinguished a greater number of determinants of velocity for the short run model. The additional variables were; economic stability, GDP and monetary shocks, value of time, inflation, and financial innovation variables. In estimating the short run dynamic equations, the econometric methodology suggested by Hendry's work, (see Hendry, Pagan, and Sargent, 1984) was adopted, that is from the general to the specific. In other words, a general model was adopted with a generous lag structure, which was simplified with the help of statistical tests, until an acceptable specific parsimonious model was derived. In this process many potential variables were dropped from the specification. The results for the full sample period mask a major problem. The majority of parameters contained in these equations are unstable, and recursive t-statistic tests revealed that their significance depended on the sample period chosen. To consider this problem still further, the sample period was divided into two sub samples, 1870-1946, and 1950-1991, corresponding to falling and rising velocity respectively. The early sample gave fairly poor results, but it was interesting to note that only two traditional velocity determinants, wealth and interest rates play a role. The post second world war sub period gave very good results, and parameter stability was not a major problem.
In consequence our statistical results would appear to support both the Friedman and Keynes hypotheses. On the one hand, a long term relationship between velocity and a few variables was identified. On the other, short run dynamic equations, over the full sample period were not stable, and the significance of individual variables unreliable. However, critiques of Hendry's "encompassing" methodology may argue that too much reliance was placed on econometric techniques, and that it was more appropriate to examine a wide variety of evidence, not all quantitative.

There also remains a number of unresolved issues which may be pointers towards further research. One direction may be to take a closer look at financial institutional innovation in the post second world war period by attempting to replicate the results of this study using quarterly data. Furthermore, results for the United Kingdom could be compared with empirical work for other countries.

Another area for development could be the extension of the divisia monetary aggregate time series using archive material, once again using quarterly data. This could be used to compare and contrast simple sum velocity with divisia velocity. Although this may prove difficult given the availability of long run reliable data given the number of redefinitions which have taken place.
Unfortunately, economic interpretation of the long run vectors derived from the Johansen estimation technique is not straightforward. Therefore developments in econometric methodology which resolve this problem could lead to a better understanding of the long run relationship.

Finally, the thesis has considered the study of the behaviour of velocity from an econometric modelling perspective. Equally, the problem could have been approached from a time series viewpoint, perhaps using state space models and the Kalman filter to understand the velocity time series. This approach being discussed only briefly.
APPENDIX

APPENDIX A  VARIABLE DEFINITIONS & SOURCES

AGOP  Agriculture Gross Total Output
  £ million
  1867 - 1914  Bellerby (1968) in Minchinton (1968)
               Table IV col.2
               Page 276/7
  1915 - 1944  Ojala (1952)
               Table XVI page 208
               Table XVII page 209
               Interpolations between groups of years
  1945 - 1990  Annual Abstract of Statistics  C.S.O.
               (Various)
  1991  Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food (1992)

BCLEAR  Bank Clearings (Total)
  £ million
  1868 - 1938  Mitchell and Deane (1962)
  1939 - 1965  Mitchell and Jones (1971)

BLEND  Bank Lending (Bank Advances)
  £ million
  1870 - 1966  Sheppard (1971)
               Table (A) 1.1
               Col.16 pages 116-117

BONDSL  British Government Securities
         Security Yields
         Long dated (20 years)
  1945 - 1991  Annual Abstract of Statistics

BONDSS  British Government Securities
         Security Yields
         Short dated (5 years)

BPFS  Benefits Paid Friendly Societies
  £ million
  = Total Sickness Pay + Total Sums at Death
  + Total Other Benefits
  1870 - 1934  Parliamentary Papers
BR  1870 - 1982  Capie and Webber (1985)  
Table III (10)  
column I  
pages 494 - 495  
1983 - 1989  Economic Trends (June 1990)  
Table 39 page 68  
1990 - 1991  Financial Statistics  

BRES  Banks' Reserves (Till Money and Balances at the Bank of England  
(£ thousand)  
1871 - 1982  Capie and Webber (1985)  
Col.IV  
pages 153 - 154  

BSAD  Building Society Advances  
£ million  
1870 - 1879  Sheppard (1971)  
Table (A) 2.4  
pages 150 - 151  
1880 - 1966  Sheppard (1971)  
Table (A) 2.4  
pages 150 - 151  
Table 378 page 363  
Table 17.22 page 434  
Table 17.13 page 294  

BSDEP  Building Society Deposits  
£ million  
1870 - 1879  Sheppard (1971)  
Table (A) 2.4  
pages 150 - 151  
1880 - 1966  Sheppard (1971)  
Table (A) 2.4  
pages 150 - 151  
Table 378 page 363  
Table 17.22 page 434  
Table 17.13 page 294  
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BSHM3 Building societies holdings of M3
£ million

BSSH Building Society Shares
£ million
1870 - 1879 Sheppard (1971) Table (A) 2.4 page 150
1880 - 1966
1967 - 1972 Annual Abstract of Statistics (1973) Table 378 page 363

C Currency - Notes and coin in circulation outside
the Bank of England
£ million
1870 Capie & Webber (1985) Quarterly Data/4
1871 - 1982 Capie & Webber (1985) Table II(2) p.153 - 154

CHAPS Clearing House Automatic Payments System
£ billion
1984 - 1990 Annual Abstract of Statistics

COPROF Company Profits, current prices
Gross trading profits of companies
£ million
1870 - 1965 Feinstein (1972) pages 74 - 76 column 3

CWM1 Money Stock M1 - Capie & Webber (1985) Definition
£ million
1870 - 1982 Capie & Webber (1985)
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DWM3 Money Stock M3 - Capie & Webber (1985) Definition
£ million
1870 - 1982 Capie & Webber (1985)

DD Demand Deposits Net of 60% of items, in transit
£ million
1870 - 1982 Capie & Webber (1985)

DIVDM3 Divisia Money Stock M3
Based on Capie and Webber M3 data
DIVM3 Divisia Money Stock M3
Based on CSO data
DIVM4 Divisia Money Stock M4
Based on CSO data
DIVM5 Divisia Money Stock M5
Based on CSO data

ELECLEAR Electronic Bank Clearing
£ billion
1976 - 1977 British Bankers Association (BBA) Annual Abstract
of Banking Statistics Volume 2 Direct Debits + Standing Orders (Interbank) + Credits
(Automated Items
1978 - 1990 Annual Abstract of Statistics

FTINDEX Financial Times Ordinary Share Index
1935 = 100
Financial Institutions Table 17
Share Price Indices page 687
Table 47
CWM3 Money Stock M3 - Capie & Webber (1985) Definition
£ million
1870 - 1982 Capie & Webber (1985)

DD Demand Deposits Net of 60% of items, in transit
£ million
1870 - 1982 Capie & Webber (1985)

DIVCM3 Divisia Money Stock M3
Based on Capie and Webber M3 data

DIVM3 Divisia Money Stock M3
Based on CSO data

DIVM4 Divisia Money Stock M4
Based on CSO data

DIVM5 Divisia Money Stock M5
Based on CSO data

ELECLEAR Electronic Bank Clearing
£ billion
1978 - 1990 Annual Abstract of Statistics

FTINDEX Financial Times Ordinary Share Index
1935 = 100
Financial Institutions Table 17
Share Price Indices page 687
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G  Government Expenditure on goods and services
£ million, current prices
1870 - 1965  Feinstein (1972)
Table 2 page T8 column 2
Public authorities current expenditure
on goods and services
Table 3 page 14 column AAXI
General government final consumption
at market prices, current prices

GCF  Government Capital Formation
Central Government, Local Authorities, &
Public Corporations
£ million, current prices
1870 - 1949  Feinstein (1972)
Table 39
Col.8 + Col.9 + Col.10
(1939 to 1947 includes all CF for W.W.2)
Table 9 Col. AAYE + AAAK
1991       Monthly Digest of Statistics No.556
April 1992 Table 1.8
Col. AAYE + AAAK

GDPA  Gross Domestic Product at factor cost
(average estimate)
£ million
1870 - 1965  Feinstein (1972)
1966 - 1990  Economic Trends Annual Supplement
1991       Economic Trends

GFC  Public authorities (Central and Local Government)
current expenditure on goods and services
£ million
1870 - 1965  Feinstein (1972)
Table 2 pages T8 - T9 Column 2
Table 3 Column AAXI
1991       Monthly Digest of Statistics C.S.O.
No.556 April 1992
Table 1.2 page 7 Column AAXI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GINVR</th>
<th>Government Investment</th>
<th>£ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1965</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table T85 - T86</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Fixed Capital Formation at current prices by sector col.8 Public Corporations + col.9 Central Government + col.10 Local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1987</td>
<td>Economic Trends Annual Supplement (1989) Table 9 page 60 col.2 &amp; col.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 - 1989</td>
<td>Economic Trends (June 1990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 1991</td>
<td>Economic Trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INEMP</th>
<th>Income from Employment</th>
<th>£ million, current prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1965</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 1 pages T4 - T7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1990</td>
<td>Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991 Table 4 DJAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Monthly Digest of Statistics April 1992 No.556 C.S.O. Table 1.3 DJAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSEMP</th>
<th>Income from Self Employment</th>
<th>£ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1888</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889 - 1965</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 1 pages T4 - T7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVR</th>
<th>Inventories - Value of physical increase in stocks and work in progress</th>
<th>£ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1965</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) page T8 Table 2 col.4 Value of Physical Increase in stocks and work in progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1989</td>
<td>Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1990 Table 3 page 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1990 - 1991  Economic Trends

IPOL Insurance Premiums Other than Life £ million
1870 - 1934  Sheppard (1971)

Total Labour Force (thousands)
1870 - 1951  Mitchell and Deane (1962) page 60  (linear interpolations)

LABOUT Life Assurance - Ordinary Business Total Outgoings £ million
1880 - 1934  Parliamentary Papers
1935 - 1945  Annual Abstract of Statistics (1947) Table 292 page 244
1946 - 1991  Annual Abstract of Statistics

LABIN Life Assurance Ordinary Business - Total Income £ million
1880 - 1934  Parliamentary Papers
1935 - 1945  Annual Abstract of Statistics (1947) Table 292 page 244
1946 - 1991  Annual Abstract of Statistics

INA Labour force non-agricultural pursuits (thousands)
1870 - 1951  Mitchell and Deane (1962) page 60  (linear interpolations)

LONCLEAR London Bank Clearing £ billion
1981 - 1990  Annual Abstract of Statistics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Start Year - End Year</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at factor cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4CSO</td>
<td>Money Stock M4 - CSO Definition</td>
<td>1963 - 1991 Financial Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ thousands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNCWP</td>
<td>Notes and coin in circulation with the public</td>
<td>1963 - 1991 Financial Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NSDS National Savings deposits and securities £ million

OD Other Deposits at the Bank of England (Capie & Webber (1985) Definition
1870 - 1982 Capie and Webber (1985)

OMIXBS Other money market instruments - excluding holdings by banks and building societies £ million

OP Industrial Output - Gross Total £ million
1870 - 1906 Hoffman (1955)
Total Industrial Production (including building) used as base from 1907 in real terms, worked backwards, and converted to current prices
1907 Census of Production (1907)
1908 - 1923 Lomax (1959)
Total Industrial Production (including building)
1924 Census of Production (1924)
1925 - 1929 Lomax (1959)
1930 Census of Production (1930)
1931 - 1934 Lomax (1959)
1935 Census of Production (1935)
1936 - 1939 Lomax (1959)
1940 - 1949 Interpolation
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PC Currency in hands of the public
(Capie & Webber (1985) Definition
1870 - 1982 Capie and Webber (1985)

PCF Private Sector Capital Formation £ million
1870 - 1965 Feinstein (1972)
Table 39 col.7
Pages T85 - T87
1966 - 1990 Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991 Table 9 col. DFDG
1991 Monthly Digest of Statistics April No. 556 Table 1.8 column DFDG
page 14

PCON Expenditure on Private Consumption £ million, current prices
1870 - 1965 Feinstein (1972)
Table 2 col. 1 page T8
1966 - 1990 Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991 Table 3 col. 1 AIIK
1991 Economic Trends
Table 3 col.1 CCBH
in real terms rebased in current prices

PD Implicit price deflator
1985 = 1
1870 - 1947 Table III (12) Column III
Gross National Product Deflator
1948 - 1991 Gross Domestic Product at market prices
average estimate, current prices, divided by
Gross Domestic Product at market prices
average estimate, 1985 prices
Economic Trends Annual Supplement
Tables 2 and 3
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDY</td>
<td>Personal Disposable Income from employment</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 1 pages T4 - T5 column 7 minus net receipts of Income Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell and Deane (1962) page 428/9 col.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 10 pages T28 - 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Trends Annual Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Population - United Kingdom - Persons thousands</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Abstract of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFTCO</td>
<td>Gross Trading Profits of Companies</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 1 page T4 - T7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991 Table 4 Col.2 CIAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly Digest of Statistics April 1992 No.556 CSO Table 1.3 col. CIAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: Includes Self-Employment for 1870 - 1888, and 1914 - 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSDBS</td>
<td>Private sector shares and deposits with Building Societies</td>
<td>Financial Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.K. private sector time deposits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBDEF</td>
<td>Rate of Interest paid on Bank Deposits</td>
<td>Capie and Webber (1985) Table III (10) column VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBSDEP</td>
<td>Rate of Interest on Building Society Deposit Accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1990</td>
<td>Annual Abstract of Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Financial Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBSSH</td>
<td>Rate of Interest on Building Society Share Accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1990</td>
<td>Annual Abstract of Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Financial Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>Rents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1965</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 1 pages T4 - T7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1972</td>
<td>Annual Abstract of Statistics (1973) CSO Table 305 page 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGER</td>
<td>German Short - term interest rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876 - 1922</td>
<td>Deutsche Bundesbank (1976) F Table 2.01 pages 278 - 279 Geldmarktzinsen -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privatdiskontsatz (Private Short Term Interest Rate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 - 1924</td>
<td>Interpolation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925 - 1944</td>
<td>Deutsche Bundesbank (1976) F Table 2.01 pages 278 - 279 Geldmarktzinsen -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privatdiskontsatz (Private Short Term Interest Rate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private short term interest rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 - 1991</td>
<td>International Financial Statistics – Germany Money Market Rate line 60b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RINTB  London Interbank - 3 month 7 day deposit rate  
(average) Percentage Rate

1963 - 1990  Economic Trends Annual Supplement  
Table 47 column 3

Table 13.8 page 143

RL  Long term rate of Interest  
Rate of interest on consols (2.5%)  
1870 - 1966  Sheppard (1971) Table A.3.7  
pages 190 - 191 Column II


RIA  Interest rates for Deposits with local authorities  
3 months Percentage rate per anum  
1956 - 1989  Economic Trends Annual Supplement  
Table 47 Column 2 page 224


RNS  Rate of Interest National Savings Investment Account  
Percentage rate per anum  
July 1991 Table 13.9

RPQD  Rate of growth of Import Prices  
1870 - 1965  Feinstein (1972) Table 61 page T133  
column 6 Price Indices - Imports of goods and services

1966 - 1991  Imports current prices divided by Imports  
1985 prices (constant prices)  
Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991

RS  Short term Interest Rate  
Prime Bank Bill Rate  
1870 - 1982  Capie and Webber (1985) Table III (10) % p.a.  
Column V page 494 - 495
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RUS United States Interest Rates

1870 - 1889 Unadjusted index of yields on American railroad bonds. United States Department of Commerce (1976) Series 476 page 1003


1971 - 1991 Federal Funds Rate International Financial Statistics United States line 60b

SDIB U.K. private sector sterling sight deposits with monetary sector. (Interest Bearing)

SDNI U.K. private sector sterling sight deposits with monetary sector. (Non Interest Bearing) (adjusted for transit items)


SPRIM Life and Other Types of Insurance Premiums Paid Yearly to U.K. based companies £ million

1870 - 1879

1880 - 1886 Life and Annuity Assurance Premiums - Total Premiums Sheppard (1971) Table (A) 2.7 pages 160 - 161 column IB

1887 - 1912 Life, Annuity, Industrial Assurance Premiums Sheppard (1971) Table (A) 2.7 pages 160 - 161 column A

1913 - 1965 As above, plus Company Accident Premiums, Company Capital and Redemption and Sinking Fund, Company Fire Insurance, Marine Insurance, Transport Employers Liability

1966 - 1974 Annual Abstract of Statistics

1974 - 1991 Association of British Insurers
STRIKES  Number of working days lost through Disputes (thousands)
1891 - 1938  Mitchell and Deane (1962) page 72
1989 - 1991  Employment Gazette

SURPCO  Gross trading surplus of public corporations £ million
1870 - 1965  Feinstein (1972) Table 1 pages T4 - T7
1966 - 1990  Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991 Table 4 Col.3 ADRD
1991  Monthly Digest of Statistics April 1992 No.556 CSO Table 1.3 col. ADRD

NOTE: For years 1939 to 1945 see SURPENT

SURPENT  Gross trading surplus of other public enterprises £ million
1870 - 1965  Feinstein (1972) Table 1 pages T4 - T7
1966 - 1990  Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1991 Table 4 Col.4 DJAQ
1991  Monthly Digest of Statistics April 1992 No.556 CSO Table 1.3 col. DJAQ

NOTE: For years 1939 to 1945 includes SURPCO

TAXCON  Taxes on Expenditure £ million
1870 - 1965  Feinstein (1972) Table 2 pages T8 and T9 col. 7
TAXI Taxes and National Insurance and Health Contributions on Personal Income
£ million, current prices

1870 - 1899  Mitchell and Deane (1962)
Table: Public Finance 3
pages 393 - 394

1900 - 1965  Feinstein (1972)
Table 14 pages T35 - T36
Column 1 and Column 3

Table 5 page 35
Total Personal Income before Tax (AIIA)
minus Total Personal Disposable Income (AIIJ)

June 1992
Table 1.5 page 11 AIIA - AIIJ

TAXR Basic rate of income tax

1870 - 1938  Mitchell and Deane (1962)
pages 428 - 429

1939 - 1950  Mitchell and Jones (1971)
page 172

TBCLEAR Total Bank Clearing (excluding electronic clearing)
£ billion

Financial Institutions 12
pages 676 - 677

1981 - 1990  Annual Abstract of Statistics

TD Time Deposits, Net of Interbank Deposits
£ million

1870 - 1982  Capie and Webber (1985)


TFA Total Assets of Financial Institutions in Great Britain

1870 - 1963  Linear interpolations between
Goldsmith's (1969) benchmarks Appendix
Table D-10

1964 - 1991  Updates using Goldsmith's sources
see table in main text in chapter 4
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TFCLG Transfers Central to Local Government £ million
1869 Mitchell and Deane (1962) Public Finance 9 Receipts of Local Authorities pages 414 - 415 column Government Grants etc
1870 - 1879 Interpolation
1880 - 1898 As 1969
1900 - 1965 Feinstein (1972) Table 13 page T33 column (4) Current grants from Central Government
1971 - 1976 National Income and Expenditure (1977) Table 8.1
1977 - 1985 National Income and Expenditure (1986) Table 8.1
1986 - 1990 National Income and Expenditure (1991) Table 8.1 column CUKZ

TFGR Transfers - Government Receipts £ million
1870 - 1899 Mitchell and Deane (1962) pages 386 - 400
1900 - 1965 Feinstein (1972) Table 14 column 7 pages T35 - T36
1966 - 1988 Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1990 Table 35 page 168 col ABKA + ABKB
1989 - 1991 Financial Statistics No. 360 April 1992 Table 2.1 page 19 column AAXA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TGEXP</th>
<th>Transfers - Government Expenditure £ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1899</td>
<td>Mitchell and Deane (1962) pages 386 - 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 - 1965</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 14 column 11 - 8 pages T35 - T36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1988</td>
<td>Economic Trends Annual Supplement 1990 Table 35 page 168 col AAB - AAX - AAY - AAYE (Table 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 - 1991</td>
<td>Financial Statistics No. 360 April 1992 Table 2.1 page 19 column AAXH - AAXI - AAYE (Table 2.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TG Total Government Expenditure minus interest payments on the national debt divided by net national income

| 1870 - 1938 | Mitchell and Deane (1962) |
| 1939 - 1950 | Mitchell and Jones (1971) |
| 1951 - 1991 | Economic Trends Annual Supplement |

TGDEF Total Government Expenditure minus interest payments on the national debt and defence expenditure divided by net national income

| 1870 - 1938 | Mitchell and Deane (1962) |
| 1939 - 1950 | Mitchell and Jones (1971) |
| 1951 - 1991 | Economic Trends Annual Supplement |

TNBFA Total non-bank Assets of Financial Institutions in Great Britain

| 1870 - 1963 | Linear interpolations between Goldsmith’s (1969) benchmarks Appendix Table D-10 excluding lines |
| 1. Bank of England |
| 5. P.O. Savings Bank |
| 7. Birmingham Municipal Bank |
| 21. Superannuation funds |
| 23. National Insurance funds |
1964 - 1987 Updates using Goldsmiths sources
see table in main text of chapter 4

TOCS Turnover Collecting Societies (Income Total)
£ million
C.S.O. Table 348 page 293
C.S.O. Table 385 page 368
C.S.O. Table 17.3 page 440
C.S.O. Table 17.21 page 300

TOPS Turnover Friendly Societies
£ million
1951 - 1991 Annual Abstract of Statistics

TOSECRLGT Turnover Securities (Government Gilts)
£ million
1870 - 1929 Parliamentary Papers
1930 - 1964 Interpolation
1965 - 1990 Quality of Markets Quarterly Review
Autumn 1990
The International Stock Exchange
London
1991 Stock Exchange Quarterly
London Stock Exchange
Spring Edition
January - March 1992

TOSECRORD Turnover Securities (Ordinary Shares)
£ million
1870 - 1929 Parliamentary Papers
1930 - 1964 Interpolation
1965 - 1990 Quality of Markets Quarterly Review
Autumn 1990
The International Stock Exchange
London
1991 Stock Exchange Quarterly
London Stock Exchange
Spring Edition
January - March 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWNCL</th>
<th>Town Bank Clearing £ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1901</td>
<td>Interpolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 - 1990</td>
<td>Annual Abstract of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Percentage Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1965</td>
<td>Feinstein (1972) Table 57 page T125 column 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UIDEP</th>
<th>Unit Trust Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 1979</td>
<td>Financial Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTWITH</th>
<th>Unit Trust Repayments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 1979</td>
<td>Financial Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W Average weekly wage rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B:
Critical Values for Cointegration Analysis

Empirical Distribution of \( \hat{\theta} \) for (\( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \))=(0,0,1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Probability of a smaller value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01 0.025 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empirical Distribution of \( \hat{\theta} \) for (\( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \))=(0,0.1,1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Probability of a smaller value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01 0.025 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empirical Distribution of \( \hat{\theta} \) for (\( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \))=(0,1,1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Probability of a smaller value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01 0.025 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.02 0.03 0.05 0.10 0.90 0.95 0.975 0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dickey and Fuller (1981, p.1063)
### Appendix B (continued)

#### Critical Values for Co-Integration Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Variables</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Engle and Yoo (1967)</th>
<th>Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dickey-Fuller Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%        5%    10%</td>
<td>1%        5%    10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-3.58     -2.93  -2.60</td>
<td>-3.55     -2.92  -1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-3.51     -2.89  -2.58</td>
<td>-3.48     -2.89  -1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200*</td>
<td>-3.46     -2.88  -2.57</td>
<td>-3.46     -2.88  -1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-4.07     -3.37  -3.03</td>
<td>-3.89     -3.40  -3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-3.68     -3.07  -2.70</td>
<td>-3.55     -3.17  -3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-4.86     -4.11  -3.73</td>
<td>-4.72     -4.03  -3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-4.58     -3.82  -3.41</td>
<td>-4.47     -3.79  -3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-4.35     -3.56  -3.20</td>
<td>-4.27     -3.58  -3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-4.94     -4.25  -3.82</td>
<td>-4.75     -4.12  -3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-4.76     -4.08  -3.67</td>
<td>-4.63     -4.10  -3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-4.70     -4.08  -3.69</td>
<td>-4.63     -4.11  -3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-5.41     -4.76  -4.34</td>
<td>-5.22     -4.70  -4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-5.18     -4.56  -4.15</td>
<td>-5.06     -4.56  -4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-5.02     -4.48  -4.14</td>
<td>-5.07     -4.49  -4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. * This figure for Engle and Yoo is 200 not 200
2. McKinnon statistics are for "no trend" case but values "with trend" are available in his paper.
3. *ng relevant statistics not quoted

**Source:** Holden and Thompson (1992), Engle and Yoo (1987), and McKinnon (1990)
Appendix C:

Construction of Transactions Velocity

All variables are in £ million unless otherwise stated.

Current Transactions

\[ CT = \text{OP} + \text{AGOP} + \text{PCON} + \text{IN} + \text{PAPG} \]

where \( \text{OP} \) = industrial output - gross total, \( \text{AGOP} \) = agriculture output - gross total, \( \text{PCON} \) = personal final consumption (expenditure on consumption of the personal sector), \( \text{IN} \) = Incomes (from employment, self employment, profit, rent), \( \text{PAPG} \) = public sector payments for goods and services.

Incomes

\[ \text{IN} = \text{INEMP} + \text{INSEMP} - \text{TAXI} + \text{PROFITCO} + \text{SURPCO} + \text{SURPENT} + \text{RENT} \]

where \( \text{INEMP} \) = income from employment, \( \text{INSEMP} \) = income from self employment, \( \text{TAXI} \) = taxes on personal income, \( \text{PROFITCO} \) = gross trading profits of companies, \( \text{SURPCO} \) = gross trading surplus of public corporations, \( \text{SURPENT} \) = gross trading surplus of other public enterprises, \( \text{RENT} \) = rent.

Public Sector Payments for Goods and Services

\[ \text{PAPG} = \text{GFC} + \text{GCF} \]

where \( \text{GFC} \) = government final consumption, \( \text{GCF} \) = government capital formation.

Transfers

\[ \text{TF} = \text{TFPS} + \text{TFGS} + \text{TFCLG} \]

where \( \text{TFPS} \) = transfers of the private sector, \( \text{TFGS} \) = transfers of the government sector (including inter-governmental transfers), \( \text{TFCLG} \) = transfers - central to local government.

Transfers Private Sector

\[ \text{TFPS} = \text{LABIN} + \text{LABOUT} + \text{LAINDIN} + \text{LAINDOUT} + \text{IPOL} + \text{TOCS} + \text{OGCS} + \text{TOFS} + \text{BPFS} \]

where \( \text{LABIN} \) = life assurance business (ordinary business) - income, \( \text{LABOUT} \) = life assurance business (ordinary business) - outgoings, \( \text{LAINDIN} \) = life assurance business (industrial business) - income, \( \text{LAINDOUT} \) = life assurance business (industrial business) - outgoings, \( \text{IPOL} \) = insurance premiums - other than life, \( \text{TOCS} \) = turnover collecting societies, \( \text{OGCS} \) = outgoings collecting societies, \( \text{TOFS} \) = turnover friendly societies, \( \text{BPFS} \) = benefits paid friendly societies.

Transfers of the Government Sector

\[ \text{TFGS} = \text{TPGEXP} + \text{TPGR} \]

where \( \text{TPGEXP} \) = transfers - Government expenditure, \( \text{TPGR} \) = transfers - Government receipts.

Asset and Portfolio Adjustment

\[ \text{APA} = \text{PCF} + \text{PORTA} \]

where \( \text{PCF} \) = private sector capital formation, \( \text{PORTA} \) = private sector portfolio adjustment.
Private Sector Portfolio Adjustment
PORTA = BSDEP + BSWITH + BSDEPREC + BSDEPWITH + NSDEP + NSWITH + UTDEP + UTWITH + BSAD + MORTR + MORTI + TOSECRORD + TOSECRGIL

where BSDEP = Building Society shares subscribed (deposits), BSWITH = Building Society shares withdrawn (including interest), BSDEPREC = Building Society deposits received, BSDEPWITH = Building Society deposits withdrawn (including interest), NSDEP = National Savings Deposits, NSWITH = National Savings withdrawals, UTDEP = Unit Trust deposits, UTWITH = Unit Trust withdrawals, BSAD = mortgage Advances (Building Societies), MORTR = Mortgage repayments of principal, MORTI = mortgage interest, TOSECRORD = turnover securities (ordinary shares), TOSECRGIL = turnover securities (government gilts).
## Transactions in the U.K. Economy 1870 - 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>AOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3179.5</td>
<td>3377.8</td>
<td>3610.8</td>
<td>3818.1</td>
<td>3794.4</td>
<td>3743.6</td>
<td>3738.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- The table above provides data on various economic transactions in the U.K. economy from 1870 to 1991.
- The data includes industrial production output, agriculture gross output, personal consumption, other consumption, income, income from employment, income from self-employment, income on personal accounts, gross trading profit of companies, gross trading surplus of public corporations, gross trading surplus of other public corporations, rent, blanket income, payment for public goods, government final consumption, government capital formation, total payment for public goods, and total current transactions.
- The variables in the table are measured in various currency units for each year.
- The data is presented in a tabular format for easier analysis and comparison over the years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>21897</td>
<td>22794</td>
<td>23696</td>
<td>24596</td>
<td>25496</td>
<td>26410</td>
<td>28124</td>
<td>29426</td>
<td>30752</td>
<td>32066</td>
<td>34116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOR</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUI</td>
<td>12105</td>
<td>13110</td>
<td>13825</td>
<td>14542</td>
<td>15362</td>
<td>16176</td>
<td>16990</td>
<td>17903</td>
<td>18991</td>
<td>20195</td>
<td>21577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMBP</td>
<td>10284</td>
<td>11344</td>
<td>12262</td>
<td>12958</td>
<td>13645</td>
<td>14102</td>
<td>15156</td>
<td>16397</td>
<td>17289</td>
<td>18160</td>
<td>19662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISNP</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2104</td>
<td>2232</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>2358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANT</td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>3865</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>4612</td>
<td>4979</td>
<td>4979</td>
<td>4979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOKFEDO</td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>2888</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td>3705</td>
<td>3983</td>
<td>3719</td>
<td>3694</td>
<td>3599</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>4616</td>
<td>4616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURFRO</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>12985</td>
<td>14104</td>
<td>15225</td>
<td>16930</td>
<td>18212</td>
<td>17976</td>
<td>18253</td>
<td>19978</td>
<td>20673</td>
<td>22294</td>
<td>24372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCR</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>3427</td>
<td>3564</td>
<td>3672</td>
<td>3919</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>4497</td>
<td>4822</td>
<td>5080</td>
<td>5595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>2313</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>2753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGU</td>
<td>4405</td>
<td>4498</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>5058</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>5911</td>
<td>6562</td>
<td>7012</td>
<td>7441</td>
<td>7813</td>
<td>82615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>5802</td>
<td>5560</td>
<td>5992</td>
<td>6154</td>
<td>6354</td>
<td>6916</td>
<td>7405</td>
<td>7765</td>
<td>7865</td>
<td>8063</td>
<td>8368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARB</td>
<td>393.796</td>
<td>436.476</td>
<td>469.943</td>
<td>523.268</td>
<td>582.155</td>
<td>654.284</td>
<td>730.17</td>
<td>820.69</td>
<td>988.675</td>
<td>1046.981</td>
<td>1176.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACCO</td>
<td>199.064</td>
<td>229.748</td>
<td>274.172</td>
<td>301.844</td>
<td>332.693</td>
<td>386.413</td>
<td>444.342</td>
<td>478.462</td>
<td>541.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUDIA</td>
<td>149.009</td>
<td>172.334</td>
<td>183.175</td>
<td>194.116</td>
<td>207.981</td>
<td>219.051</td>
<td>232.558</td>
<td>252.94</td>
<td>264.262</td>
<td>278.196</td>
<td>300.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCON</td>
<td>877.261</td>
<td>957.303</td>
<td>1063.812</td>
<td>1115.674</td>
<td>1235.916</td>
<td>1337.832</td>
<td>1469.06</td>
<td>1684.232</td>
<td>1809.496</td>
<td>2009.802</td>
<td>2227.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MROCR</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>2.149</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>2.713</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MROF</td>
<td>209.843</td>
<td>218.914</td>
<td>249.759</td>
<td>260.532</td>
<td>266.375</td>
<td>286.776</td>
<td>296.246</td>
<td>302.86</td>
<td>314.783</td>
<td>317.175</td>
<td>338.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MROKC</td>
<td>102.835</td>
<td>102.021</td>
<td>123.12</td>
<td>133.976</td>
<td>137.42</td>
<td>139.82</td>
<td>144.77</td>
<td>158.477</td>
<td>177.947</td>
<td>201.349</td>
<td>204.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MROKD</td>
<td>81.129</td>
<td>66.448</td>
<td>64.476</td>
<td>77.417</td>
<td>78.098</td>
<td>80.46</td>
<td>84.565</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>97.957</td>
<td>100.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MROKDF</td>
<td>165.126</td>
<td>160.505</td>
<td>210.138</td>
<td>240.132</td>
<td>269.698</td>
<td>281.623</td>
<td>307.538</td>
<td>333.804</td>
<td>356.79</td>
<td>390.44</td>
<td>440.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MROKFC</td>
<td>133.701</td>
<td>141.266</td>
<td>161.244</td>
<td>177.682</td>
<td>184.025</td>
<td>189.897</td>
<td>204.438</td>
<td>213.436</td>
<td>230.183</td>
<td>247.996</td>
<td>264.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MROKCR</td>
<td>70.271</td>
<td>74.247</td>
<td>88.733</td>
<td>99.095</td>
<td>106.447</td>
<td>112.866</td>
<td>121.123</td>
<td>120.093</td>
<td>135.56</td>
<td>151.046</td>
<td>158.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>139300</td>
<td>160872</td>
<td>176385</td>
<td>203999</td>
<td>222200</td>
<td>252385</td>
<td>241903</td>
<td>259915</td>
<td>264380</td>
<td>307887</td>
<td>317772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>6036</td>
<td>6089</td>
<td>7158</td>
<td>8079</td>
<td>8486</td>
<td>9879</td>
<td>11103</td>
<td>11442</td>
<td>12492</td>
<td>12174</td>
<td>12270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>76481</td>
<td>67878</td>
<td>101344</td>
<td>119989</td>
<td>136043</td>
<td>155412</td>
<td>170565</td>
<td>187028</td>
<td>199425</td>
<td>217618</td>
<td>241275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>222507</td>
<td>255336</td>
<td>284878</td>
<td>332007</td>
<td>370490</td>
<td>390576</td>
<td>425656</td>
<td>459425</td>
<td>496297</td>
<td>537779</td>
<td>585517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EINPS</td>
<td>78005</td>
<td>86572</td>
<td>98483</td>
<td>115866</td>
<td>137783</td>
<td>149773</td>
<td>158538</td>
<td>169847</td>
<td>180883</td>
<td>195708</td>
<td>217529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHRMPS</td>
<td>120779</td>
<td>112648</td>
<td>126044</td>
<td>136822</td>
<td>143984</td>
<td>149860</td>
<td>152420</td>
<td>157827</td>
<td>161648</td>
<td>163218</td>
<td>167869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>26510</td>
<td>28447</td>
<td>30641</td>
<td>342290</td>
<td>409500</td>
<td>461190</td>
<td>500780</td>
<td>562390</td>
<td>643540</td>
<td>654860</td>
<td>688502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCI</td>
<td>16430</td>
<td>19903</td>
<td>22266</td>
<td>27145</td>
<td>27441</td>
<td>27341</td>
<td>27176</td>
<td>35528</td>
<td>46656</td>
<td>51767</td>
<td>470649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERFED</td>
<td>4506</td>
<td>5095</td>
<td>5466</td>
<td>5710</td>
<td>6209</td>
<td>7974</td>
<td>9502</td>
<td>10004</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>7120</td>
<td>8056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBRFED</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNY</td>
<td>7388</td>
<td>8443</td>
<td>9758</td>
<td>11286</td>
<td>13231</td>
<td>16346</td>
<td>17700</td>
<td>18587</td>
<td>19604</td>
<td>21792</td>
<td>23826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>882277</td>
<td>105045</td>
<td>119510</td>
<td>143999</td>
<td>167628</td>
<td>176516</td>
<td>186594</td>
<td>207637</td>
<td>223057</td>
<td>243280</td>
<td>259762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDPC</td>
<td>27042</td>
<td>29469</td>
<td>33407</td>
<td>38830</td>
<td>46940</td>
<td>55734</td>
<td>60683</td>
<td>65787</td>
<td>69760</td>
<td>73805</td>
<td>79381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1C</td>
<td>10115</td>
<td>9548</td>
<td>9797</td>
<td>11058</td>
<td>12480</td>
<td>15598</td>
<td>15781</td>
<td>15794</td>
<td>16120</td>
<td>18835</td>
<td>19389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI5</td>
<td>71277</td>
<td>39055</td>
<td>43176</td>
<td>49816</td>
<td>55384</td>
<td>61420</td>
<td>66970</td>
<td>71114</td>
<td>75921</td>
<td>82920</td>
<td>86608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI6</td>
<td>34175</td>
<td>33936</td>
<td>35865</td>
<td>44374</td>
<td>52088</td>
<td>55638</td>
<td>634111</td>
<td>644481</td>
<td>670163</td>
<td>802374</td>
<td>867687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABK</td>
<td>5462</td>
<td>7991</td>
<td>8435</td>
<td>9660</td>
<td>10725</td>
<td>11769</td>
<td>12814</td>
<td>13859</td>
<td>14903</td>
<td>15948</td>
<td>16933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABC</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>3447</td>
<td>4309</td>
<td>5172</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6488</td>
<td>7761</td>
<td>8424</td>
<td>9487</td>
<td>10580</td>
<td>11313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABKM</td>
<td>656.959</td>
<td>790.715</td>
<td>854.562</td>
<td>1008.735</td>
<td>1296.551</td>
<td>1430.859</td>
<td>1685.658</td>
<td>1812.348</td>
<td>2138.229</td>
<td>2159.242</td>
<td>2314.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABKCMC</td>
<td>9829.198</td>
<td>12386.52</td>
<td>14407.52</td>
<td>16632.16</td>
<td>18886.61</td>
<td>21089.14</td>
<td>23380.55</td>
<td>25523.98</td>
<td>27932.14</td>
<td>30069.56</td>
<td>32231.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACI</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>2577</td>
<td>2771</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>3486</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>5328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACT</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACTS</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>2666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

314
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1872</th>
<th>1873</th>
<th>1874</th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>1876</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Premiums (other than life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Collecting Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outgoing Collecting Society (Claims)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Friendly Societies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits Paid Friendly Societies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRIMARILY &amp; COLLECTIVE SOCIETIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income Col &amp; Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Benefit Col &amp; Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR TRANSFERS **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Transfers - Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFERRED PUBLIC SECTOR **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFERRED COLLECTIVE &amp; LOCAL GOVERNMENT **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset Transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR ASSET TRANSACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Sector Capital Formation **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PORTFOLIO ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Society Shares Deposits Subscribed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Society Shares Withdrawn (incl Int)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Society Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Society Deposits Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Savings Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Savings Withdrawals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Trusts Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Trust Withdrawals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortgage Advances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortgage Rights of Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortgage Rights of Subsidiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortgage Intangible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL INVESTMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock Investments (Ordinary Shares)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock Investments (Government Gilts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Securities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share-Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL PORTFOLIO ADJUSTMENT **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banks - Clearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loans Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>824,829</td>
<td>1045,344</td>
<td>1291,913</td>
<td>1320,876</td>
<td>1304,023</td>
<td>1370,464</td>
<td>1023,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td>3524</td>
<td>4826</td>
<td>5928</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>5937</td>
<td>5686</td>
<td>4982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.69</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>40.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>22.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>120.58</td>
<td>120.58</td>
<td>120.58</td>
<td>120.58</td>
<td>120.58</td>
<td>120.58</td>
<td>120.58</td>
<td>120.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICLD</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCF</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPEH</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>25.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPRU</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPEH</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>25.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPRU</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSED</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1060.52</td>
<td>1107.23</td>
<td>1146.509</td>
<td>1174.379</td>
<td>1155.548</td>
<td>1160.311</td>
<td>1177.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TISED</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>4992</td>
<td>4886</td>
<td>5794</td>
<td>6357</td>
<td>6221</td>
<td>5929</td>
<td>5799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPRI</td>
<td>44.241</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td>51.06</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>58.42</td>
<td>62.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR &amp;</td>
<td>25.943</td>
<td>25.847</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>30.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS</td>
<td>117.52</td>
<td>117.65</td>
<td>123.82</td>
<td>126.28</td>
<td>129.03</td>
<td>127.85</td>
<td>128.77</td>
<td>131.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD</td>
<td>145.44</td>
<td>143.53</td>
<td>150.31</td>
<td>154.23</td>
<td>157.64</td>
<td>156.26</td>
<td>158.26</td>
<td>163.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP &amp;</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEB</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSYNTH</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>45.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSYXH</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>33.96</td>
<td>36.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSYXH</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEB &amp;</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>45.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEB &amp;</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>33.96</td>
<td>36.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBX &amp;</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXH</td>
<td>1641.89</td>
<td>1750.57</td>
<td>1834.14</td>
<td>1444.35</td>
<td>1384.76</td>
<td>1394.62</td>
<td>1346.07</td>
<td>1760.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXH</td>
<td>694.2</td>
<td>761.9</td>
<td>780.1</td>
<td>684.8</td>
<td>668.2</td>
<td>647.8</td>
<td>633.7</td>
<td>797.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>1919</th>
<th>1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOCO</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOBR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elfbr</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPBR</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRD</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRD</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHD</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCF</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBDX</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td>40.88</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>42.01</td>
<td>42.57</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>43.70</td>
<td>44.26</td>
<td>44.82</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>45.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRX</td>
<td>59.27</td>
<td>64.42</td>
<td>65.46</td>
<td>66.45</td>
<td>67.44</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td>69.42</td>
<td>70.41</td>
<td>71.41</td>
<td>72.41</td>
<td>73.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBXE</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>61.42</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>66.94</td>
<td>68.94</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>72.94</td>
<td>74.94</td>
<td>76.94</td>
<td>78.94</td>
<td>80.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YNEX</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEX</td>
<td>100.24</td>
<td>105.06</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>108.46</td>
<td>109.24</td>
<td>110.24</td>
<td>111.24</td>
<td>112.24</td>
<td>113.24</td>
<td>114.24</td>
<td>115.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEX</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>70.34</td>
<td>72.95</td>
<td>75.69</td>
<td>78.44</td>
<td>81.19</td>
<td>83.94</td>
<td>86.69</td>
<td>89.44</td>
<td>92.24</td>
<td>95.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEX</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>2509</td>
<td>2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEX</td>
<td>12697</td>
<td>12594</td>
<td>13814</td>
<td>14191</td>
<td>14343</td>
<td>14608</td>
<td>15276</td>
<td>15912</td>
<td>21196</td>
<td>21214</td>
<td>32853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEX</td>
<td>31462</td>
<td>34168</td>
<td>39668</td>
<td>39857</td>
<td>40165</td>
<td>40375</td>
<td>40587</td>
<td>40800</td>
<td>41028</td>
<td>41258</td>
<td>41494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEX</td>
<td>15402</td>
<td>15388</td>
<td>16814</td>
<td>17336</td>
<td>15496</td>
<td>16398</td>
<td>16847</td>
<td>20559</td>
<td>22975</td>
<td>30699</td>
<td>42153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSi</td>
<td>569.128</td>
<td>625.77</td>
<td>715.279</td>
<td>781.654</td>
<td>823.224</td>
<td>867.773</td>
<td>921.308</td>
<td>984.632</td>
<td>1033.765</td>
<td>1095.76</td>
<td>1194.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V0</td>
<td>331.313</td>
<td>351.068</td>
<td>421.061</td>
<td>463.856</td>
<td>496.247</td>
<td>518.279</td>
<td>551.077</td>
<td>600.881</td>
<td>642.227</td>
<td>718.302</td>
<td>749.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOCu</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>41.49</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>57.62</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>52.44</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>57.97</td>
<td>59.24</td>
<td>61.73</td>
<td>64.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>60.51</td>
<td>60.72</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>66.26</td>
<td>71.88</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>84.26</td>
<td>87.07</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>94.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiPp</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>2541</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>2637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CePp</td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>6088</td>
<td>6397</td>
<td>6818</td>
<td>7208</td>
<td>7619</td>
<td>8179</td>
<td>8666</td>
<td>9231</td>
<td>9718</td>
<td>10328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPp</td>
<td>7884</td>
<td>8201</td>
<td>8638</td>
<td>9208</td>
<td>10132</td>
<td>10620</td>
<td>11330</td>
<td>12282</td>
<td>13353</td>
<td>13487</td>
<td>14635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REU</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECFP</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td>2795</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>3280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HREEP</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>377.3</td>
<td>378.2</td>
<td>393.1</td>
<td>435.5</td>
<td>535.7</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>555.1</td>
<td>702.6</td>
<td>886.4</td>
<td>1019.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTHREEP</td>
<td>171.6</td>
<td>223.2</td>
<td>256.7</td>
<td>286.6</td>
<td>327.6</td>
<td>363.8</td>
<td>409.6</td>
<td>454.6</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>542.4</td>
<td>672.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBERC</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBARC</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REHREEP</td>
<td>1186.7</td>
<td>1329.6</td>
<td>1471.9</td>
<td>1640.4</td>
<td>1668.3</td>
<td>1782.3</td>
<td>1882.4</td>
<td>1859.1</td>
<td>1986.2</td>
<td>2076.1</td>
<td>2394.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTHREEP</td>
<td>1179.2</td>
<td>1381.3</td>
<td>1460.1</td>
<td>1598.9</td>
<td>1688.5</td>
<td>1702.8</td>
<td>1847.8</td>
<td>1877.7</td>
<td>1976.5</td>
<td>2121.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHREEP</td>
<td>29.48</td>
<td>21.567</td>
<td>45.01</td>
<td>77.46</td>
<td>99.44</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO</td>
<td>373.2</td>
<td>394.4</td>
<td>394.9</td>
<td>374.1</td>
<td>374.7</td>
<td>517.3</td>
<td>509.8</td>
<td>548.6</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>849.4</td>
<td>1043.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIO</td>
<td>195.3</td>
<td>216.2</td>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>210.3</td>
<td>226.4</td>
<td>288.6</td>
<td>322.6</td>
<td>344.4</td>
<td>431.6</td>
<td>505.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMT</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>198.6</td>
<td>210.1</td>
<td>235.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFT</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1961.9</td>
<td>2397.6</td>
<td>2357.1</td>
<td>2732.1</td>
<td>2688.7</td>
<td>2941.3</td>
<td>2992.72</td>
<td>3361.93</td>
<td>3778.87</td>
<td>4032.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RERH</td>
<td>1769.1</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>2341</td>
<td>2311.3</td>
<td>2645.93</td>
<td>2551.4</td>
<td>2748.768</td>
<td>2930.61</td>
<td>3036.87</td>
<td>3065.08</td>
<td>3036.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**234**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108X.159</td>
<td>1377.581</td>
<td>1492.918</td>
<td>1722.59</td>
<td>1281.558</td>
<td>1328.918</td>
<td>1362.278</td>
<td>1390.641</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825.922</td>
<td>845.165</td>
<td>958.666</td>
<td>1151.353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOCH</td>
<td>67.66</td>
<td>70.79</td>
<td>78.23</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>79.87</td>
<td>84.13</td>
<td>88.81</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>100.67</td>
<td>107.76</td>
<td>119.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COX</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>39.56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>50.76</td>
<td>55.27</td>
<td>52.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>40.75</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>41.46</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>55.68</td>
<td>48.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.689</td>
<td>111.37</td>
<td>112.41</td>
<td>117.28</td>
<td>114.32</td>
<td>102.67</td>
<td>126.47</td>
<td>145.38</td>
<td>153.95</td>
<td>157.72</td>
<td>172.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.334</td>
<td>50.94</td>
<td>51.18</td>
<td>51.76</td>
<td>51.62</td>
<td>50.35</td>
<td>54.87</td>
<td>58.47</td>
<td>54.71</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3486.36</td>
<td>4183.91</td>
<td>4731.47</td>
<td>5472.185</td>
<td>5530.473</td>
<td>5732.762</td>
<td>6439.064</td>
<td>7828.556</td>
<td>8724.826</td>
<td>12064.35</td>
<td>15792.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENDP</td>
<td>4823</td>
<td>4364</td>
<td>7682</td>
<td>8444</td>
<td>8751</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>10269</td>
<td>11174</td>
<td>11447</td>
<td>11918</td>
<td>23457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THDR</td>
<td>11524</td>
<td>13454</td>
<td>14973</td>
<td>16079</td>
<td>17013</td>
<td>21218</td>
<td>22583</td>
<td>23996</td>
<td>27024</td>
<td>31797</td>
<td>43041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK</td>
<td>16766</td>
<td>19689</td>
<td>22882</td>
<td>25353</td>
<td>27766</td>
<td>30053</td>
<td>35222</td>
<td>35934</td>
<td>39671</td>
<td>51465</td>
<td>64498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKGL</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>2884</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>3565</td>
<td>4726</td>
<td>7709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>3533</td>
<td>3917</td>
<td>4068</td>
<td>4712</td>
<td>5096</td>
<td>5167</td>
<td>6458</td>
<td>7424</td>
<td>8964</td>
<td>10254</td>
<td>12120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258.7</td>
<td>1495.5</td>
<td>1821.9</td>
<td>1960.2</td>
<td>2282.9</td>
<td>2890.2</td>
<td>3821.2</td>
<td>4965.4</td>
<td>5804.7</td>
<td>6326.7</td>
<td>6946.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805.3</td>
<td>955.4</td>
<td>1087.7</td>
<td>1476.4</td>
<td>1744.1</td>
<td>2028.1</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>3067.4</td>
<td>4574.2</td>
<td>5375.8</td>
<td>6119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.9</td>
<td>271.5</td>
<td>295.4</td>
<td>336.4</td>
<td>377.5</td>
<td>428.6</td>
<td>493.6</td>
<td>568.7</td>
<td>653.8</td>
<td>748.9</td>
<td>863.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>258.9</td>
<td>287.7</td>
<td>289.9</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350.5</td>
<td>2653.1</td>
<td>2876.8</td>
<td>3268.4</td>
<td>3297.9</td>
<td>3165.3</td>
<td>4024.8</td>
<td>4064.7</td>
<td>4231.1</td>
<td>4667.1</td>
<td>5799.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2570.1</td>
<td>3090.9</td>
<td>2834.5</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td>3295.9</td>
<td>3210.8</td>
<td>3843</td>
<td>3793.5</td>
<td>4484</td>
<td>4415.1</td>
<td>5570.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>136.6</td>
<td>328.9</td>
<td>326.7</td>
<td>317.1</td>
<td>303.9</td>
<td>343.6</td>
<td>374.4</td>
<td>374.1</td>
<td>320.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.9</td>
<td>254.2</td>
<td>250.1</td>
<td>238.9</td>
<td>232.9</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>254.8</td>
<td>259.7</td>
<td>282.1</td>
<td>295.9</td>
<td>306.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>452.3</td>
<td>589.7</td>
<td>619.7</td>
<td>706.3</td>
<td>819.3</td>
<td>951.9</td>
<td>1226.9</td>
<td>1282.9</td>
<td>1488.5</td>
<td>1929.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4424.4</td>
<td>5409.26</td>
<td>5032.95</td>
<td>6261.35</td>
<td>6421.6</td>
<td>7286.2</td>
<td>9265.1</td>
<td>11345.7</td>
<td>13030.1</td>
<td>13505.4</td>
<td>17016.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOX</td>
<td>3478.6</td>
<td>3564</td>
<td>5806</td>
<td>9118.3</td>
<td>8712.8</td>
<td>8812.6</td>
<td>13376.8</td>
<td>20065.7</td>
<td>17079.1</td>
<td>12616</td>
<td>17564.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOXEN-center</td>
<td>15895.6</td>
<td>16609.9</td>
<td>27972</td>
<td>21034.6</td>
<td>18659.8</td>
<td>27349.7</td>
<td>47397.2</td>
<td>32743.4</td>
<td>20410.9</td>
<td>2626.4</td>
<td>7844.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONW</td>
<td>346605</td>
<td>348477</td>
<td>408954</td>
<td>515777</td>
<td>606055</td>
<td>678851</td>
<td>738094</td>
<td>947372</td>
<td>1310845</td>
<td>1479238</td>
<td>1605547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_P</td>
<td>261860</td>
<td>310635</td>
<td>42948.7</td>
<td>672630.3</td>
<td>73899.4</td>
<td>315186.8</td>
<td>1071833</td>
<td>1641086</td>
<td>1975833</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>47260.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLC</td>
<td>411576</td>
<td>455468</td>
<td>518585</td>
<td>595946</td>
<td>699192</td>
<td>773087</td>
<td>843550</td>
<td>1071833</td>
<td>1641086</td>
<td>1975833</td>
<td>2352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix D: Assets of Financial Institutions in Great Britain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank of England</strong></td>
<td>2961</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>3480</td>
<td>3633</td>
<td>3841</td>
<td>3945</td>
<td>3989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deposit Banks</strong></td>
<td>29824</td>
<td>31057</td>
<td>32825</td>
<td>34257</td>
<td>36774</td>
<td>36145</td>
<td>35531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.O. savings banks</strong></td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>1497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustees Savings Banks</strong></td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discount Houses</strong></td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Societies</strong></td>
<td>4862</td>
<td>5531</td>
<td>6036</td>
<td>7465</td>
<td>8294</td>
<td>9289</td>
<td>10818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hire Purchase Companies</strong></td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment and Trust Co.</strong></td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>3619</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>6932</td>
<td>6286</td>
<td>5785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life assurance companies</strong></td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collecting societies</strong></td>
<td>378</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial and Provident Soc.</strong></td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Societies</strong></td>
<td>261</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Superannuation funds</strong></td>
<td>2965</td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>3879</td>
<td>4664</td>
<td>4668</td>
<td>4673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superannuation funds, local authorities</strong></td>
<td>791</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other public superannuation funds</strong></td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Insurance funds</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>54336</td>
<td>58118</td>
<td>61380</td>
<td>68399</td>
<td>73660</td>
<td>75551</td>
<td>75311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-bank assets (TBNA)</strong></td>
<td>488561</td>
<td>52055</td>
<td>55010</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>66823</td>
<td>68628</td>
<td>68362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio</strong></td>
<td>0.8993717</td>
<td>0.895678</td>
<td>0.89622</td>
<td>0.903749</td>
<td>0.907182</td>
<td>0.908367</td>
<td>0.907729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank of England</strong></td>
<td>4153</td>
<td>3995</td>
<td>6009</td>
<td>7120</td>
<td>7916</td>
<td>9522</td>
<td>10262</td>
<td>11401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deposit Banks</strong></td>
<td>39623</td>
<td>52334</td>
<td>74493</td>
<td>84153</td>
<td>107662</td>
<td>136274</td>
<td>144850</td>
<td>167408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.I. savings banks</strong></td>
<td>1474.7</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustee Savings Banks</strong></td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discount Houses</strong></td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>2618</td>
<td>2517</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>3934</td>
<td>4308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Societies</strong></td>
<td>12919</td>
<td>15246</td>
<td>17545</td>
<td>20093</td>
<td>24203</td>
<td>28202</td>
<td>34286</td>
<td>39538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hire Purchase Companies</strong></td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>2986</td>
<td>3423</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td>4750</td>
<td>6234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment and Trust Co.</strong></td>
<td>7501</td>
<td>9226</td>
<td>7102</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>8016</td>
<td>9450</td>
<td>9934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life insurance companies</strong></td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>2581</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>3081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collecting societies</strong></td>
<td>511</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial and Provident Soc.</strong></td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>2377</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>3579</td>
<td>4439</td>
<td>5342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Societies</strong></td>
<td>349</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Superannuation funds</strong></td>
<td>6176</td>
<td>7109</td>
<td>7489</td>
<td>6307</td>
<td>9642</td>
<td>11487</td>
<td>16983</td>
<td>20253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superannuation funds, local authorities</strong></td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>2330</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>3867</td>
<td>5135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other public superannuation funds</strong></td>
<td>2523</td>
<td>3060</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>4333</td>
<td>5795</td>
<td>8301</td>
<td>10586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Insurance funds</strong></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>4197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Finance corporations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86996.7</td>
<td>107803</td>
<td>131843</td>
<td>146119</td>
<td>162426</td>
<td>223980</td>
<td>250492</td>
<td>290204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-bank assets (TMBA)</strong></td>
<td>76966</td>
<td>100147</td>
<td>122164</td>
<td>134623</td>
<td>168363</td>
<td>206598</td>
<td>230887</td>
<td>267849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio</strong></td>
<td>0.917807</td>
<td>0.928982</td>
<td>0.926446</td>
<td>0.921324</td>
<td>0.922911</td>
<td>0.922395</td>
<td>0.921734</td>
<td>0.922855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Co-Direct</td>
<td>Co-Indirect</td>
<td>Direct Indirect</td>
<td>Total (Net)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of England</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>3330</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix D (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Co-Direct</th>
<th>Co-Indirect</th>
<th>Direct Indirect</th>
<th>Total (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of England</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>3330</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix E (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Co-Direct</th>
<th>Co-Indirect</th>
<th>Direct Indirect</th>
<th>Total (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of England</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>3330</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix F (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Co-Direct</th>
<th>Co-Indirect</th>
<th>Direct Indirect</th>
<th>Total (Net)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of England</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>3330</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Debt</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of England</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>16963</td>
<td>18815</td>
<td>21940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Banks</td>
<td>704158</td>
<td>728649</td>
<td>816592</td>
<td>1014290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. saving banks</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Houses</td>
<td>9539</td>
<td>11566</td>
<td>12015</td>
<td>15276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Societies</td>
<td>140602</td>
<td>160096</td>
<td>188844</td>
<td>187013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire Purchase Companies</td>
<td>19910</td>
<td>24612</td>
<td>42086</td>
<td>44255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and Trust Co.</td>
<td>51000</td>
<td>53037</td>
<td>59147</td>
<td>79616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance companies</td>
<td>7527</td>
<td>8190</td>
<td>8832</td>
<td>9786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting societies</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Provident Soc.</td>
<td>15645</td>
<td>18460</td>
<td>19811</td>
<td>22677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly Societies</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Superannuation funds</td>
<td>141844</td>
<td>161319</td>
<td>198994</td>
<td>265028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation funds, local authorities</td>
<td>25401</td>
<td>26470</td>
<td>29289</td>
<td>37669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public superannuation funds</td>
<td>43975</td>
<td>39612</td>
<td>43973</td>
<td>48414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Insurance funds</td>
<td>5879</td>
<td>7481</td>
<td>10635</td>
<td>10580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1185000</td>
<td>1277534</td>
<td>1454584</td>
<td>1764842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-bank assets (TMBA)</td>
<td>1137064</td>
<td>1220952</td>
<td>1394187</td>
<td>1693020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>0.958804</td>
<td>0.958712</td>
<td>0.958478</td>
<td>0.959304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix E:
Provisional Johansen Vectors for Income Velocity

120 observations from 1872-1991 Maximum Lag in VAR = 2
List of variables included in cointegrating vector:
ln V1, ln(Y/PN), RL, ROWN, ln(TNBFA/TFA), ln(C/M), ln BANKS

List of eigenvalues in descending order: 0.33767 0.29132 0.22378 0.15327 0.084214 0.058970 0.002694

LR Test Based on Maximal Eigenvalue of the Stochastic Matrix (with trend in DGP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>95% critical value</th>
<th>90% critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r=0</td>
<td>r&gt;=1</td>
<td>49.4388</td>
<td>45.2770</td>
<td>42.3170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=1</td>
<td>r&gt;=2</td>
<td>41.3216</td>
<td>39.3720</td>
<td>36.7620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=2</td>
<td>r&gt;=3</td>
<td>30.3989</td>
<td>33.4610</td>
<td>30.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=3</td>
<td>r&gt;=4</td>
<td>19.9647</td>
<td>27.0670</td>
<td>24.7340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=4</td>
<td>r&gt;=5</td>
<td>10.5567</td>
<td>20.9670</td>
<td>18.5980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=5</td>
<td>r&gt;=6</td>
<td>7.2936</td>
<td>14.0690</td>
<td>12.0710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=6</td>
<td>r&gt;=7</td>
<td>0.0323</td>
<td>3.7620</td>
<td>2.6870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LR Test Based on Trace of Stochastic Matrix

| r=0  | r>=1        | 159.0066  | 124.2430           | 118.5000           |
| r=1  | r>=2        | 109.5678  | 94.1550            | 89.483             |
| r=2  | r>=3        | 68.2462   | 68.5240            | 64.843             |
| r=3  | r>=4        | 37.8474   | 47.2100            | 43.949             |
| r=4  | r>=5        | 17.8827   | 29.6800            | 26.785             |
| r=5  | r>=6        | 7.3260    | 15.4100            | 13.325             |
| r=6  | r>=7        | 0.0323    | 3.7620             | 2.687              |

332
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Vector 1</th>
<th>Vector 2</th>
<th>$x^2(2)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln V1</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Y/FN)$^p$</td>
<td>0.78104</td>
<td>0.829100</td>
<td>10.8834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>0.22635</td>
<td>-0.064927</td>
<td>9.4725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWN</td>
<td>-0.45409</td>
<td>0.028552</td>
<td>18.2855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(TNBFA/ TFA)</td>
<td>7.93210</td>
<td>3.738400</td>
<td>11.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(C/M)</td>
<td>-0.57085</td>
<td>0.837210</td>
<td>8.2612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln BANKS</td>
<td>-0.34075</td>
<td>-0.255580</td>
<td>8.4603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value $F(2) = 5.991$. 

Sample 1872-1991 Maximum lag in VAR = 2
120 observations from 1872-1991 Maximum Lag in VAR = 2
List of variables included in cointegrating vector:
In VI, ln(Y/PN)^, RL, ROWN, ln(TNBFA/TFA), ln(C/M)
List of eigenvalues in descending order: 0.32996
0.22364 0.17485 0.10015 0.065913 0.0024831

LR Test Based on Maximal Eigenvalue of the Stochastic Matrix (with trend in DGP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>95% critical value</th>
<th>90% critical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r=0</td>
<td>r&gt;=1</td>
<td>48.0502</td>
<td>39.3720</td>
<td>36.7620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=1</td>
<td>r&gt;=2</td>
<td>30.3760</td>
<td>33.4610</td>
<td>30.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=2</td>
<td>r&gt;=3</td>
<td>23.0621</td>
<td>27.0670</td>
<td>24.7340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=3</td>
<td>r&gt;=4</td>
<td>12.6626</td>
<td>20.9670</td>
<td>18.5980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=4</td>
<td>r&gt;=5</td>
<td>8.1822</td>
<td>14.0690</td>
<td>12.0710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r&lt;=5</td>
<td>r&gt;=6</td>
<td>0.2983</td>
<td>3.7620</td>
<td>2.6870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LR Test Based on Trace of Stochastic Matrix

| r=0  | r=1        | 122.6315  | 94.1550            | 89.4830            |
| r=1  | r=2        | 74.5813   | 68.5240            | 64.8430            |
| r=2  | r=3        | 44.2053   | 47.2100            | 43.9490            |
| r=3  | r=4        | 21.1432   | 29.6800            | 26.7850            |
| r=4  | r=5        | 8.4806    | 15.4100            | 13.3250            |
| r=5  | r=6        | 0.2983    | 3.7620             | 2.6870             |
Sample 1872-1991 Maximum lag in VAR = 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Vector 1</th>
<th>Vector 2</th>
<th>$\chi^2(2)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln Vi</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Y/PN)$^p$</td>
<td>0.40231</td>
<td>-2.92400</td>
<td>3.3399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>0.41806</td>
<td>0.47320</td>
<td>10.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWN</td>
<td>-0.74121</td>
<td>0.10252</td>
<td>20.7612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(TNBFA/TFA)</td>
<td>11.04440</td>
<td>-14.41700</td>
<td>3.5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(C/M)</td>
<td>-1.58620</td>
<td>-3.6346</td>
<td>3.1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical value $\chi^2(2) = 5.991$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX F

**Time Series Properties of Proposed Short Run Relationship Variables**

(Wealth, Interest Rates, and Prices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\theta_1$</th>
<th>$\theta_2$</th>
<th>$\theta_3$</th>
<th>$\tau_{\text{const}}$</th>
<th>$\tau_{\text{time}}$</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>I(0)</th>
<th>I(1)</th>
<th>I(2)</th>
<th>I(3)</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\ln (Y/WE)$</td>
<td>2.7756 (4.71)</td>
<td>7.9601 (4.88)</td>
<td>1.4266 (6.69)</td>
<td>1.6416 (1.86)</td>
<td>1.6660 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>0.27642 (2.8459)</td>
<td>-0.3422 (2.8457)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln ECBCR$</td>
<td>1.5487 (4.71)</td>
<td>9.5261 (4.88)</td>
<td>0.4134 (6.03)</td>
<td>1.2191 (1.96)</td>
<td>1.2445 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>0.27869 (2.8457)</td>
<td>-0.9122 (2.8457)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln CYCLE$</td>
<td>0.58174 (4.71)</td>
<td>18.2004 (4.88)</td>
<td>27.3628 (6.69)</td>
<td>-0.7210 (1.86)</td>
<td>0.76272 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-7.3575 (2.8459)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln R$</td>
<td>1.9449 (4.71)</td>
<td>1.6834 (4.88)</td>
<td>2.4410 (6.03)</td>
<td>-0.48254 (1.96)</td>
<td>1.9842 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-0.62195 (2.8459)</td>
<td>-0.4276 (2.8457)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln RG$</td>
<td>5.0288 (4.71)</td>
<td>2.3541 (4.88)</td>
<td>2.7716 (6.03)</td>
<td>0.18393 (1.96)</td>
<td>2.3425 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-0.72186 (2.8457)</td>
<td>-0.0796 (2.8459)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln NIM$</td>
<td>1.7851 (4.71)</td>
<td>1.6008 (4.88)</td>
<td>2.1183 (6.03)</td>
<td>-0.70979 (1.96)</td>
<td>1.9465 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-0.07213 (2.8457)</td>
<td>-0.4912 (2.8459)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln GDP$</td>
<td>0.59561 (4.71)</td>
<td>0.76487 (4.88)</td>
<td>0.30406 (6.03)</td>
<td>-1.23211 (1.96)</td>
<td>0.77163 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-2.6187 (2.8457)</td>
<td>-7.3588 (2.8459)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln R$</td>
<td>7.7858 (4.71)</td>
<td>4.0931 (4.88)</td>
<td>3.6389 (6.03)</td>
<td>-1.0067 (1.96)</td>
<td>1.9457 (1.96)</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>1.7690 (2.8459)</td>
<td>-3.6997 (2.8457)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln P$</td>
<td>1.9989 (4.71)</td>
<td>13.6095 (4.88)</td>
<td>20.4123 (6.03)</td>
<td>6.38917 (1.96)</td>
<td>1.9997 (1.96)</td>
<td>trended</td>
<td>-6.3836 (2.8459)</td>
<td>-3.4475 (2.8457)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln M(0)$</td>
<td>7.9403 (4.71)</td>
<td>7.3555 (4.88)</td>
<td>10.8587 (6.03)</td>
<td>-3.3956 (1.96)</td>
<td>2.9900 (1.96)</td>
<td>trended</td>
<td>-4.5909 (2.8457)</td>
<td>-3.4475 (2.8457)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Time Series Properties of Proposed Short Run Relationship Variables

(G.D.P. and Monetary Shocks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\theta_1$</th>
<th>$\theta_2$</th>
<th>$\theta_3$</th>
<th>$t_{\text{const}}$</th>
<th>$t_{\text{time}}$</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>I(0)</th>
<th>I(1)</th>
<th>I(2)</th>
<th>I(3)</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In DEL</td>
<td>1.3622</td>
<td>6.1642</td>
<td>7.6161</td>
<td>-1.2944</td>
<td>-1.1671</td>
<td>nontrended</td>
<td>-3.7172</td>
<td>-2.6561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INR</td>
<td>0.048926</td>
<td>0.01925</td>
<td>7.12703</td>
<td>-0.16832</td>
<td>0.25119</td>
<td>nontrended</td>
<td>-7.6557</td>
<td>-2.8655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In MR</td>
<td>2.8532</td>
<td>3.15671</td>
<td>1.3284</td>
<td>1.5644</td>
<td>1.43891</td>
<td>nontrended</td>
<td>-0.069133</td>
<td>-2.8657</td>
<td>-6.7259</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In TNR</td>
<td>0.022931</td>
<td>1.8319</td>
<td>1.5916</td>
<td>-0.32480</td>
<td>0.14977</td>
<td>nontrended</td>
<td>-1.7856</td>
<td>-2.8659</td>
<td>-5.9201</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSKP</td>
<td>0.010644</td>
<td>0.22650</td>
<td>0.0059079</td>
<td>-0.30197</td>
<td>-0.10221</td>
<td>nontrended</td>
<td>-3.1233</td>
<td>-2.8657</td>
<td>-6.9200</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDLV</td>
<td>0.002553</td>
<td>0.23599</td>
<td>0.0024577</td>
<td>0.131080</td>
<td>0.28722</td>
<td>nontrended</td>
<td>-1.0466</td>
<td>-2.4855</td>
<td>-7.8652</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Time Series Properties of Proposed Short Run Relationship Variables (Institutional Factors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$a_3$</th>
<th>$t_s$ (constant)</th>
<th>$t_{Time}$</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>I(0)</th>
<th>I(1)</th>
<th>I(2)</th>
<th>I(3)</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln (C/M)</td>
<td>2.0960</td>
<td>1.4109</td>
<td>1.2055</td>
<td>0.11300</td>
<td>-1.4486</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>0.5568</td>
<td>-5.1460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln (C/O)</td>
<td>0.9625</td>
<td>0.8504</td>
<td>0.69462</td>
<td>-0.2872</td>
<td>-0.90106</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-0.65336</td>
<td>-4.7643</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln BMRR</td>
<td>6.7143</td>
<td>9.9465</td>
<td>9.3407</td>
<td>0.16363</td>
<td>-2.9912</td>
<td>trnd</td>
<td>0.89968</td>
<td>-4.4738</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln L/MVJ</td>
<td>6.1457</td>
<td>5.1074</td>
<td>7.5567</td>
<td>2.51316</td>
<td>2.4791</td>
<td>trnd</td>
<td>-3.0522</td>
<td>-10.7449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln FORM</td>
<td>0.1192</td>
<td>0.96532</td>
<td>3.5097</td>
<td>4.6168</td>
<td>-0.9024</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-2.5592</td>
<td>-3.3765</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Symbiosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln (CG/BRR/ TDA)</td>
<td>2.1917</td>
<td>1.5489</td>
<td>1.5035</td>
<td>-1.3970</td>
<td>1.4804</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-0.8957</td>
<td>-3.3059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln TMD</td>
<td>0.8406</td>
<td>3.1317</td>
<td>4.6641</td>
<td>2.8814</td>
<td>-0.8956</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-2.9225</td>
<td>-8.4707</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln SRO</td>
<td>4.9285</td>
<td>10.4401</td>
<td>8.9379</td>
<td>1.6629</td>
<td>2.2199</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-3.594</td>
<td>-8.0043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln TD</td>
<td>2.8675</td>
<td>3.8271</td>
<td>3.4762</td>
<td>-2.1169</td>
<td>1.7277</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-2.8318</td>
<td>-4.7937</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln TOH</td>
<td>10.7650</td>
<td>8.5958</td>
<td>12.7238</td>
<td>4.3550</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>-3.6318</td>
<td>-1.885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Time Series Properties of Proposed Short Run Relationship Variables (Financial Innovation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(a_f)</th>
<th>(a_g)</th>
<th>(t_c)</th>
<th>(t_{time})</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>I(0)</th>
<th>I(1)</th>
<th>I(2)</th>
<th>I(3)</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In ADI (1970-1991)</td>
<td>0.09481</td>
<td>3.0807</td>
<td>3.1580</td>
<td>0.34681</td>
<td>0.05812</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-2.0577</td>
<td>(-2.9201)</td>
<td>-2.8800</td>
<td>(-2.9213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CISH (1966-1991)</td>
<td>1.0555</td>
<td>4.2978</td>
<td>3.9309</td>
<td>0.7070</td>
<td>0.0574</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-0.47056</td>
<td>(-2.9187)</td>
<td>-3.3818</td>
<td>(-2.9287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In MANN (1966-1991)</td>
<td>1.2217</td>
<td>4.9248</td>
<td>5.9561</td>
<td>-1.3849</td>
<td>1.1696</td>
<td>trended</td>
<td>-1.7967</td>
<td>(-2.9226)</td>
<td>0.59632</td>
<td>(-2.9271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In EMAY (1870-1991)</td>
<td>2.6522</td>
<td>3.0172</td>
<td>1.6752</td>
<td>0.08577</td>
<td>1.6397</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>0.02278</td>
<td>(-2.8857)</td>
<td>-0.827</td>
<td>(-2.8859)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In REMP (1930-1991)</td>
<td>0.970803</td>
<td>0.096205</td>
<td>0.072140</td>
<td>-0.053498</td>
<td>0.05691</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-0.36293</td>
<td>(-2.9190)</td>
<td>-6.4915</td>
<td>(-2.9267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In FDAY (1940-1991)</td>
<td>0.075644</td>
<td>0.5618</td>
<td>0.81256</td>
<td>0.36049</td>
<td>0.15184</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-1.261</td>
<td>(-2.9190)</td>
<td>-9.3021</td>
<td>(-2.9267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In TBP (1940-1991)</td>
<td>2.7348</td>
<td>1.1393</td>
<td>1.6172</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>-1.4916</td>
<td>non trended</td>
<td>-1.7639</td>
<td>(-2.9190)</td>
<td>-5.5279</td>
<td>(-2.9267)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes

Chapter 3

1. It is interesting to note the parameter instability between equation 3.8 (sample 1909-1958) and equation 3.15 (sample 1880-1970).

Chapter 4

1. For a full definition and derivation of the following terms, the reader should refer to Pesaran and Pesaran (1991), Appendix B.19.1 Estimation and hypothesis testing in cointegrated systems by the Johansen method - ML estimation and cointegration tests, pages 222-223.

2. Microfit 3.0 does not allow for full implementation of the Johansen literature. Therefore the long-run model and short-run model cannot be solved simultaneously. This could have been achieved using the RATS software, but this was unavailable. Here, the Johansen vectors residuals were saved, and then entered as a lagged variable using OLS for the short-run dynamic equations.

Chapter 5

This was a document published by the Bank of England in May 1971. It had three aims, i) to increase competition in the Banking Sector, ii) to improve the bank regulatory system to help demand management policy, iii) measures to help the monetary authorities control the money supply. For a full discussion and the implications of CCC see Gowland (1984) and Hall (1983).

Chapter 7

1. The absence of inflation in the long run equation stems from its origins. It is derived from a permanent income long-run demand for money function, (see Bordo and Jonung 1981, 1987, 1990), defined in real terms as:

\[ \log (M/PN) = A_0 + A_1 \log (Y/PN)^p + A_2 i + e \]  

(Al)

where \( (M/PN) \) = real money balances per capita, \( (Y/PN)^p \) = permanent income per capita, and \( i \) is an interest rate.

It follows from this analysis that the demand for money is a demand for real balances. That is the demand for nominal money is proportional to the general price level.

Let us now define the velocity of circulation in similar terms.

\[ \log V = \log (Y/PN) - \log (M/PN) \]  

(A2)

So velocity equals real income per capita divided by real money balances per capita.
Substituting (A1) into (A2) gives
\[
\log V = \log \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right) - A_0 - A_1 \log \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)^p - A_2 i + e \quad (A3)
\]
this can also be written as:
\[
\log V = -A_0 + (1+A_1) \log \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)^p - A_2 i + \log \left( \frac{Y}{Y'} \right) + e \quad (A4)
\]
The term \((Y/Y')\) is the ratio of measured to permanent real per capita income, (defined as cycle elsewhere in the thesis). Bordo and Jonung (1987) use this proxy to avoid the problem of calculating permanent prices independently from permanent income. This is useful when price expectations vary greatly over a sample. (see Klein, 1977).

However, in the long run;
\[
Y = Y' \quad (A5)
\]
so that
\[
\frac{Y}{Y'} = 1 \quad (A6)
\]
As the logarithm of one is zero, equation (A4) becomes;
\[
\log V = -A_0 + (1-A_1) \log \left( \frac{Y}{PN} \right)^p - A_2 i + e \quad (A7)
\]
With the addition of the institutional terms, this equation becomes the initial starting point of analysis of the long run relationship, and explains why \(P\) does not enter explicitly.

2. Full definition and sources of all variables can be found in appendix A.
3. The actual statistical results can be found in appendix E.

Chapter 8
1. The foreign portfolio term for the United States was also considered but was not pursued as it did not improve the empirical results.

Chapter 9
1. If one accepts that \(TG\) is moving counter cyclically to velocity, representing the stabilization role of central government.
2. Estimation of the specification omitting \(ATG\) and \(AFD\) resolve the misspecification problem but create additional statistical problems.
REFERENCES


Briscoe J. (1694), Discourse on the Latf^ Fundg. London.


Cantillon R. (1732), Essai sur la nature du commerce en general, reprinted for Harvard University, Boston, 1892.


Friedman M. (1983), "Monetary Variability: The United States and Japan", *Journal of Money Credit and Banking*, vol.15, pp.339-343

347


Foville de A (1907), La monnaie, Paris.


Godfrey L.G. (1978a), "Testing against general autoregressive and moving average error models when the regressors include lagged dependent variables, Econometrica, 46, pp. 1293-1302.
Godfrey L.G. (1978b), "Testing for higher order serial correlation in regression equations when the regressors include lagged dependent variables", Econometrica, 46, pp.1303-10


Gurley J.G. and E.S. Shaw (1960), Money in a Theory of Finance, Brookings Institute Washington D.C.


Hume D (1752), "Of money" Vol I of Essays and Treatises, new edition, Edinburgh: Bells and Bradfute; Cadell and Davis 1804.


Johnson H.G. (1972), "Recent Developments in Monetary Theory: A Commentary", in Further Essays in Monetary Economics, London: George Allen Unwin


351


Lang J (1811), Grundlinien der politischen Arithmetik, Kharkov


Levasseur E (1858), La question de l'or : les mines de Californie et d'Australie, Paris


Marget A W (1942), The Theory of Prices, New York : Prentice Hall


Romer C. (1986b), "Is the Stabilisation of the Postwar Economy a Figment of the data?", *American Economic Review*, pp. 314-34


Thornton H (1802), _An Enquiry into the Nature and the effect of Paper Credit of Great Britain_. London.


Walras L (1874), _Elements d'economie politique pure_, Lausanne: Corbaz


THE BRITISH LIBRARY
BRITISH THESIS SERVICE

TITLE

AUTHOR
Jonathan David Charles RILEY

DEGREE
Ph.D

AWARDING BODY
LONDON GUILDFHALL UNIVERSITY

DATE
1995

THESIS NUMBER
DX188604

THIS THESIS HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction. Some pages may have indistinct print, especially if the original papers were poorly produced or if awarding body sent an inferior copy. If pages are missing, please contact the awarding body which granted the degree.

Previously copyrighted materials (journals articles, published texts etc.) are not filmed.

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that it's copyright rests with its author and that no information derived from it may be published without the author's prior written consent.

Reproduction of this thesis, other than as permitted under the United Kingdom Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under specific agreement with the copyright holder, is prohibited.