

# EXCHANGE RATE DEPRECIATION AND THE NIGERIA'S AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL SECTOR

## ABSTRACT

*This study examines the effect of exchange rate depreciation on the agricultural and industrial sectors of the Nigerian economy using annual data from 1981 to 2021 in an autoregressive distributed lag(ARDL) model. The findings show that the effect of exchange rate depreciation on industrial and agricultural output was fairly similar. Exchange rate depreciation, inflation, interest rate, and government expenditure have a negative effect on industrial output in the short run and a positive effect in the long run. Similarly, past agricultural output, exchange rate depreciation, and government expenditure have a negative effect on agricultural output in the short run and a positive effect in the long run. Inflation also has a long-term positive effect on agricultural output. It is recommended, among other things that the high exchange rate volatility needs to be checked to enable realistic forecasts and sound production decisions in the agricultural and industrial sectors.*

**Keywords:** Exchange Rate Depreciation, Output, Short-Run Effects, Long-Run Effects, Autoregressive Distributed Lag Model, Nigeria

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The exchange rate is one of the intermediate policy variables through which the monetary authority influences economic activities. It is one of the channels through which monetary policy is transmitted to the macro economy with the aim of promoting internal and external stability such as price stability, sustainable economic growth, healthy balance of payment, and full employment. Hence, changes in exchange rates affect other macroeconomic variables. It can lead to changes in the domestic prices of goods and services, affect the levels of spending of individuals, firms, and even the public sector, affect the balance of payment stance of the country, and ultimately affect the growth trajectory of the economy.

Numerous exchange rate regimes have been practiced globally ranging from the extreme cases of fixed exchange rate systems such as the currency boards and unions to a freely floating regime. In most cases, countries tend to practice a mixture of regimes such as adjustable peg,

**Commented [MF1]:** Re-write: ' ... have negative effects ... '

**Commented [MF2]:** In recommendation, I suggest to rephrase the sentence and focus on the results and analysis conducted throughout the article (e.g. the results of exchange rate and government expenditure and other variables), and raise more weight, in your recommendation, on the variables that generate considerable effect on industrial and/or agricultural outputs for policymakers.

For example, the results shows that the coefficient of government capital expenditure has substantial positive effect on driving industrial and agricultural outputs among other variables; thus recommendations should focus on the policies that enhance the positive relationships in the long-run.

**Commented [MF3]:** Place a semi comma (;) instead of period.

**Commented [MF4]:** Place a semi comma (;) instead of period.

crawling peg, target zone/crawling bands and managed float depending on what suits their peculiar economic conditions. However, irrespective of the system adopted, changes in the exchange rate affect macroeconomic fundamentals such as import, export, current account balances, general price level, interest rate, agricultural output, industrial output, etc (Chang and Tan, 2008).

**Commented [MF5]:** Indicate what you are describing in this sentence. For example, you should insert in the sentence the following:  
exchange rate systems

In Nigeria, the exchange rate arrangements have undergone significant changes over the years. From the fixed regime in the 1960s to a pegged arrangement between the 1970s and the mid-1980s and finally to the various types of the floating regime since 1986 following the adoption of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). These changes are not however peculiar to the Naira alone as the US dollar for instance was fixed in gold terms until 1971 when it was de-linked and has since been floated (Sanusi, 2004).

Like every other macroeconomic policy, exchange rate policies are made to produce desirable macroeconomic outcomes in all sectors of the economy. The role of the agricultural and industrial sectors in any economy cannot be over-emphasized. Various theories have explained this importance amongst which is the Rostow stages of growth theory which emphasizes investment and development of the agricultural and some core industrial sectors as the precondition for takeoff to economic growth and development (Rostow, 1959). For a developing country like Nigeria with a highly young population and a high number of people engaged in agriculture, understanding the effect of external shocks through exchange rate movement on the agricultural and industrial sectors is key to actualizing economic growth and development in the country given the country's over-dependence on oil exports as a major source of income.

Over the years, the Nigerian Naira in relation to the currencies of other countries like the US dollar has steadily depreciated. This has continued despite the various interventions by the

Central Bank in the foreign exchange market. Theoretically, currency depreciation is expected to lead to an increase in the demand for locally produced goods and a reduction in imports in line with the Marshall-Lerner conditions (Jhingan, 2004). Therefore, from the underpinnings of how the exchange rate affects external trade, an increase in domestic output can be a response to currency depreciation.

While the effect of exchange rate movement on aggregate economic output is a topic of interest, the effect of exchange rate on sectoral output is also important to understand the effect of exchange rate changes on the economy on a more disaggregated basis. This research is therefore conducted primarily to examine the impact of exchange depreciation on the industrial and agricultural output in the short and long run using data from 1981 to 2020. Some of the previous works in this area were on the impact of exchange rate on the manufacturing sector (Umeh and Ameh, 2010), exchange rate dynamism on current account balances (Akpan, 2012,) impact of exchange rate on economic growth (Lartey, 2007), the impact of exchange rate on general price level (Udoh and Egwaikhide, 2008; Odusola and Akinlo, 2001).

Commented [MF6]: 'runs' instead of 'run'

## 2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Theoretical Framework

Theoretically, the link between exchange rate and economic activities is expressed in the *Keynesian Macroeconomic Theory* where net export which is a component of aggregate demand is linked to the exchange rate (Mankiw, 2009). From the components of aggregate expenditure, national income is equal to household spending on consumption, business spending on investments, government spending, and the net of foreigners spending on domestic goods and domestic spending on foreign goods. A change in any of the four variables all things being equal will lead to a change in the national income. The national income identity is expressed as follows;

$$Y = C + I + G + X - M \quad (1)$$

Where Y is the national income, C is household consumption, I is investment, and X-M is the exports minus imports. Now, taking out the net exports and holding other variables constant, a change in the real exchange rate will lead to a change in a country's net exports. The real exchange rate which is defined as the nominal exchange rate multiplied by the relative price levels shows the rate at which foreign goods can be exchanged for domestic goods. It is given as:


$$\varepsilon = e \cdot \frac{p^*}{p} \quad (2)$$

Where  $p$  is the price of goods in the foreign country,  $p^*$  is the price of goods in the domestic country and  $e$  is the nominal exchange rate. The real exchange rate is therefore determined by the nominal exchange rate, domestic prices, and foreign prices as depicted in the equation. The higher the nominal exchange rate relative prices held constant, the higher the real exchange rate, hence the real exchange rate is positively related to the nominal exchange rate. Thus, when the nominal exchange rate depreciates with relative prices held constant, the real exchange rate will depreciate, domestic goods will become cheaper, foreign goods will become more expensive, demand will shift to domestic goods and the country's net exports will improve. This negative relationship between the real exchange rate and net export is depicted in the figure below.

**Figure 1:** The Relationship between Real Exchange Rate and Net Export

**Commented [MF7]:** The author needs also to describe what is the meaning of 'G' in the national income equation.

**Commented [MF8]:** Better to place a star "\*" instead of 'x' in the equation of the real exchange rate.



Based on the aggregate expenditure theory of the Keynesian model, a similar theory that explains the relationship between exchange rate and economic output is known as the Absorption Approach to exchange rate determination. According to this theory, a country's deficit in its balance of payments means that people are 'absorbing' more than they produce, that is, national income is less than domestic expenditure on consumption and investment. Using the national income identity absorption is simple:

$$Y = C + I + G + X - M \quad (3)$$

$\underbrace{\hspace{2cm}}$   
 Absorption

If absorption; the sum of  $(C + I + G)$  is represented by  $A$  and the balance of payments  $(X - M)$  is represented by  $B$  then, (3) above becomes:

$$Y = A + B \text{ or } B = Y - A \quad (4)$$

Equation (4) simply means that the national current account of a country is the difference between national income (Y) and absorption (A). Thus, the balance of payment can be improved by either increasing domestic income or reducing the absorption. To achieve this purpose, the absorption approach advocates a currency devaluation which leads to increases in exports, reduces imports, and increases the national income given that the economy is operating

below the full employment level i.e., there are unemployed resources. This increase in income induced by devaluation and export will further increase income through the multiplier effect. If the economy is however at full employment level, this devaluation will lead to an increase in prices instead of output growth.

## **2.2 Empirical Literature**

Empirical studies investigating the impact of exchange rate dynamics on the agricultural and industrial sectors of Nigeria have contributed valuable insights to the understanding of macroeconomic relationships within the country's economy. While limited research specifically explores this nexus, existing studies shed light on various dimensions of how exchange rate movements influence industrial production, agricultural exports, and broader economic performance.

Akinlo and Lawal (2015) utilized a vector error correction model (VECM) to explore the relationship between exchange rate depreciation and industrial production in Nigeria. Their findings indicated a long-run association between exchange rate depreciation and industrial output. Interestingly, they observed that while money supply shocks significantly affected industrial production, exchange rate depreciation itself did not directly impact the extent of industrial output.

In contrast, Ogunmuyiwa and Adelowokan (2018) adopted time series analysis methods, including the Box Jenkins Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) approach and the Chow breakpoint test, to examine the influence of exchange rate on industrial output over a similar period. Surprisingly, their study concluded that no long-run relationship existed between exchange rate movements and industrial production in Nigeria. Waziri et al. (2017) focused on the export of agricultural raw materials and economic growth, employing the Autoregressive Distributed Lag Model (ARDL). Their research highlighted a positive impact of the exchange rate on the

export of agricultural raw materials, suggesting a potential link between exchange rate dynamics and agricultural sector performance.

Iwegbu and Nwaogwugwu (2019) investigated the effects of exchange rate shocks on key sectors of Nigeria's economy across different regulatory regimes. Through Structural Vector Regression (SVAR) and related methods, they found that agricultural and industrial outputs did not demonstrate significant responsiveness to exchange rate shocks in the short and long **run** under regulated conditions. However, in a guided deregulated regime, industrial output was more negatively impacted by exchange rate shocks than agricultural output in the long run.

**Commented [MF9]:** Place 'runs' instead of 'run'.

Ekundayo et al. (2019) took a broader perspective by examining the macroeconomic implications of exchange rate depreciation using the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) Bounds testing Cointegration approach. Their study suggested that while Naira depreciation did not notably affect output per capita, it did have positive effects on trade, prices, and interest rates.

Effiong and Okon (2020) focused on monetary policy tools and exchange rate stability's role in stimulating output growth. They found that a stable exchange rate could indeed promote economic growth. Additionally, Okon et al. (2021) explored the relationship between exchange rate and inflation, highlighting a negative interaction between exchange rate movements and inflation in terms of economic growth.

In a more recent study, Effiong, Arinze, and Okon (2022) delved into exchange rate movements' effects on fiscal and monetary policy interactions, aiming to understand the connection between exchange rate dynamics and the real economy. Their findings underscored the critical role of precise policy formulation and implementation in mitigating the potentially adverse impacts of exchange rate fluctuations on the real economy.

These diverse empirical studies collectively emphasize the nuanced and multifaceted nature of exchange rate dynamics and their implications for key sectors of Nigeria's economy. While findings vary across studies, they collectively contribute valuable insights for policymakers and researchers seeking to navigate the complex interplay between exchange rates, industrial production, agricultural performance, and broader economic stability and growth in Nigeria.

### 3.0 METHODOLOGY

The objective of this study is achieved by using the econometric method to analyze data. The data used in this paper are secondary in nature ranging from 1981 to 2021. They were obtained from the statistical bulletin of the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN 2021 bulletins).

#### 3.1 Model Specification

This work is based on the open economy version of the Keynesian theory of aggregate demand where an increase in the nominal exchange rate leads to an increase in the real exchange which further leads to an increase in net export and ultimately domestic output. Previous studies were also taken into consideration in the choice of variables used in the model of this study, particularly the work of Ekundayo et al. (2019) with modifications. The model of this study is expressed as follows;

$$IND = f(EXCH, INF, GOV, RIR) \quad (5)$$

$$AGR = f(EXCH, INF, GOV, RIR) \quad (6)$$

Where;

$IND_t$  = Industrial output(N' Billions)

$AGR_t$  = Agricultural output (N' Billions)

$EXCH_t$  = CBN official exchange rate of the naira to dollar

$GOV_t$  = government capital expenditure(N' Billions)

$RIR_t$  = Real Interest Rate(%)

Commented [MF10]: Please state below the meaning of 'INF'

Mathematically stated as:

$$LIND_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 EXCH_t + \beta_2 INF_t + \beta_3 LGOV_t + \beta_4 RIR_t + \mu_t \quad (7)$$

$$LAGR_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 EXCH_t + \beta_2 INF_t + \beta_3 LGOV_t + \beta_4 RIR_t + \mu_t \quad (8)$$

Where;

$LIND_t$  = The log of industrial output

$LAGR_t$  = The log of agricultural output

$EXCH_t$  = CBN official exchange rate of the naira to dollar

$LGOV_t$  = The log of government capital expenditure

$RIR_t$  = Real Interest Rate(%)

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$  and are the model coefficients

$\beta_0$  = intercept term

$\mu_t$  = disturbance term

### 3.2 Analytical Technique

The advanced econometric technique of the Autoregressive Distributed Lag model (ARDL) is employed to examine the long-run and short-run effect of exchange rate depreciation on agricultural and industrial output. In the ARDL model, the dependent variable is expressed as a function of the lag value of the dependent variable and the current and lag values of the explanatory variables. The ARDL models for this study are expressed as follows;

#### Model I

$$LIND_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sum_{k=i}^p LIND_{t-i} + \beta_2 EXCH_t + \beta_3 \sum_{k=i}^q EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_4 LGOV_t + \beta_5 \sum_{k=i}^q LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_6 RIR_t + \beta_7 \sum_{k=i}^q RIR_{t-i} + \mu \quad (9)$$

#### Model II

$$LAGR_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sum_{k=i}^p LIND_{t-i} + \beta_2 EXCH_t + \beta_3 \sum_{k=i}^q EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_4 LGOV_t + \beta_5 \sum_{k=i}^q LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_6 RIR_t + \beta_7 \sum_{k=i}^q RIR_{t-i} + \mu \quad (10)$$

**Commented [MF11]:** Please state below the meaning of 'INF'

**Commented [MF12]:** Equations 5 and 6 above shows, among other variables, that inflation is a function of industrial and agricultural outputs respectively; whereas inflation is not included in the econometric models 9 and 10!  
Please clarify or place inflation in the mentioned models?

**Commented [MF13]:** Equations 5 and 6 above shows, among other variables, that inflation is a function of industrial and agricultural outputs respectively; whereas inflation is not included in the econometric models 9 and 10!  
Please clarify or place inflation in the mentioned models?

### 3.3 Analytical Procedures

The process of estimating the models is as follows;

**Test for Stationarity:** The test for stationarity is an essential procedure that must be undertaken before estimating a regression model to avoid the problem of spurious regression and also give insight into the appropriate regression technique to adopt (Gujarati, 2009). The Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test will be used to conduct this test since it adjusts for serial correlation. The general form is;

$$\Delta Y_t = \alpha + \sum_{k=1}^p \delta Y_{t-k} + \sum_{k=1}^p \phi \Delta Y_{t-k} + u_t \quad (11)$$

Where  $Y_t$  stands for the time series data of interest,  $\Delta$  is the first difference operator, “t” is time, and “t-i” stands for time lag. Greek letters ( $\alpha$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\phi$ ) are parameters to be estimated and  $u_t$  is error term.

**ARDL Bond Test for Co-integration:** Co-integration test is used to show whether the linear combination of non-stationary time series is stationary. That is, although the time series is integrated of say order one I (1), its linear combination can be I (0). Economically speaking, two variables will be co-integrated if they have a long-term, or equilibrium relationship between them (Gujarati, 2009).

To carry out this test, the ARDL Bounds test is employed. The benefit of this test lies in its ability to handle time series integrated of I (0) and I (1) without differencing. It is conducted under the null hypothesis of no co-integration. The F-statistics value will be compared against two critical value bounds (upper and lower bound). If the computed F-statistic falls below the lower bound at 0.05 significant level we would accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no co-integration. If on the other hand, the F-statistic exceeds the upper bound at 0.05 significant level, we conclude that we have co-integration. Finally, the test would be inconclusive if the F-statistic falls between the lower and upper bounds.

The equation of the bond test procedure is specified as follows;

#### Model I

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta LIND_t = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sum_{k=i}^p LIND_{t-i} + \beta_2 \sum_{k=i}^p EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_3 \sum_{k=i}^q INFt_{t-i} + \\ & \beta_4 \sum_{k=i}^q LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_5 \sum_{k=i}^q RIR_{t-i} + \beta_6 \sum_{k=i}^p \Delta EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_7 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta INFt_{t-i} + \\ & \beta_8 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_9 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta RIR_{t-i} + U_t \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

#### Model II

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta LAGR_t = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sum_{k=i}^p LAGR_{t-i} + \beta_2 \sum_{k=i}^p EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_3 \sum_{k=i}^q INFt_{t-i} + \\ & \beta_4 \sum_{k=i}^q LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_5 \sum_{k=i}^q RIR_{t-i} + \beta_6 \sum_{k=i}^p \Delta EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_7 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta INFt_{t-i} + \\ & \beta_8 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_9 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta RIR_{t-i} + U_t \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

If the variables are not co-integrated then there would be no basis for estimating the long-run equations. However, if the variables are co-integrated, equations 7 and 8 which are the long-run equations are estimated as well as the short run error correction model.

The Error Correction Model (ECM): In the presence of a long-run relationship between the dependent and independent variables, an Error Correction Model (ECM) is estimated to show the speed of adjustment to long run equilibrium. The model for this study is expressed as follows;

#### Model I

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta LIND_t = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sum_{k=i}^p \Delta LIND_{t-i} + \beta_6 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_7 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta INFt_{t-i} + \\ & \beta_8 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_9 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta RIR_{t-i} + \lambda ECM_{t-i} + \mu_t \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

#### Model II

$$\Delta LAGR_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sum_{k=i}^p \Delta LAGR_{t-i} + \beta_6 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta EXCH_{t-i} + \beta_7 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta INF_{t-i} + \beta_8 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta LGOV_{t-i} + \beta_9 \sum_{k=i}^q \Delta RIR_{t-i} + \lambda ECM_{t-i} + \mu_t \quad (13)$$

It is expected that  $ECM_{t-i}$  should fall between 0 and -1. If  $ECM_{t-i}$  is statistically significant, it is an indication that any short-run deviation between the dependent and independent variables will converge back to the long-run equilibrium.

### 3.4) Post Estimation Diagnostics

Regression analysis is based on certain assumptions. These assumptions include that the error terms are normally distributed, the absence of serial correlation, and the absence of heteroscedasticity. Consequently, the normality test, serial correlation test, and heteroscedasticity test are carried out to check the fulfillment of regression assumptions. A model stability test is also conducted.

## 4.0 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

In this chapter, our results will be presented and analyzed. It is divided into four parts starting with the descriptive statistics, unit root and co-integration test followed by the short and long dynamics of the model, the post estimation tests and ending with the discussion of the results.

### 4.1 Unit Root, and Cointegration Test

#### Unit Root Test

Table 1 below shows the test for stationarity using both the Augmented Dickey-Fuller and Phillips-Perron tests. The result shows that LAGR, LIND, EXCH, and LGOV are not stationary at level but at first difference while RIR is stationary at level using both tests. However, while INF was reported to be stationary at level by Augmented Dickey-Fuller it was found to be non-stationary at level and stationary at first difference by Phillips-Perron test hence we conclude that it is not stationary at level.

**Table 1: Unit Root Test**

VARIABLE	Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test		
	Level	1st Difference	Order of Integration
<b>LAGR</b>	-2.05579	-3.991906	I (1)
<i>P- Value</i>	(0.263)	(0.0037)	
<b>LIND</b>	-0.62828	-4.745687	I (1)
	(0.8526)	(0.0004)	
<b>EXCH</b>	2.161587	-4.126391	I (1)
<i>P- Value</i>	(0.9999)	(0.0026)	
<b>RIR</b>	-7.35955		I (0)
<i>P- Value</i>	0		
<b>LGOV</b>	-1.0836	-6.356808	I (1)
<i>P- Value</i>	(0.7127)	0	
<b>INF</b>	-2.95847		I (0)
	0.0479		

**Commented [MF14]:** There is a clear and well presentation of Unit Root results in Table 1 and the stationary results are in line the ARDL assumptions, where the order of integration are I(0) and/or I(1) is one of the assumption to carry test by ARDL regression. However, Table 1 shows the results of Augmented Dickey-Fuller only, whereas the author stated above that stationary tests will include also the Phillips-Perron test and should be presented in Table 1 or in a separate table naming Table 2

**Co-integration Test**

The Bound test results for the two models are presented in Table 2 below. From the table, since the F-statistic value of 17.98 and 8.54 for models I and II respectively is more than the upper bound value of 3.49 at a 0.05 significant level, we conclude that our variables have a long-run relationship.

**Table 2: Co-integration Test**

**Model I**

F-Bounds Test	Null Hypothesis: No levels relationship			
	Value	Signif.	I(0)	I(1)
<b>F-statistic</b>	17.98208	10%	2.2	3.09
<b>K</b>	4	5%	2.56	3.49
		2.5%	2.88	3.87
		1%	3.29	4.37

**Model II**

F-Bounds Test		Null Hypothesis: No levels relationship		
Test Statistic	Value	Signif.	I(0)	I(1)
<b>F-statistic</b>	8.538630	10%	2.2	3.09
<b>K</b>	4	5%	2.56	3.49
		2.5%	2.88	3.87
		1%	3.29	4.37

#### 4.2 Long Run Analysis

Following the result of the bond test for cointegration which shows the existence of a long-run relationship, equations 7 and 8 are estimated. **Table 3** below shows the ARDL long-run dynamics of the models. Model I shows that exchange rate depreciation has a positive impact on industrial output with a coefficient of 0.003894. The model also shows that inflation and government capital expenditure positively impact industrial output in the long run with a coefficient of 0.011712 and 1.033396, respectively. Surprisingly, the real interest rate was found not to have a significant effect on investment in the long run perhaps because expectations have been adjusted and the reality of the high cost of investment accepted. Model II on the other hand shows that exchange rate depreciation, inflation, and government capital expenditure have a positive impact on agricultural output with coefficients of 0.001967, 0.010881, and 1.033396 respectively.

**Table 3: Long Run Coefficients**

##### Model I

Levels Equation				
Dependent Variable: LIND				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
***EXCH	0.003894	0.000661	5.889603	0.0000
**INF	0.011712	0.005027	2.329917	0.0299
***LGOV	0.813006	0.062815	12.94282	0.0000
RIR	0.002662	0.008666	0.307206	0.7617

**Commented [MF15]:** Incorrect figure, where Table 3 shows a coefficient of 0.813006 for government capital expenditure in Model I.

**Commented [MF16]:** Subsections 4.2 and 4.3 are only descriptive of the long-run results for Models I & II. Analysis of the results should discuss the results in terms of the economic and scientific meanings of the positive or negative results of each coefficient to the dependent variable, as well in relation to the size/percentage effect of the coefficient on the dependent variable (for example, in the result of Exchange Rate, the size of coefficient is only 0.003894 which means exchange rate depreciation has only 0.3894% influence on industrial output in the long-run, whereas a change in inflation and capital expenditure have 1.1712% and 81.3006% effect on industrial output, respectively, in the long-run). Therefore, the size of the coefficient of the independent variable has a relative **economic value** in its effect on the dependent variable. For example a 1% depreciation in exchange rate result in a 0.3894% positive impact on industrial output while a 1% change in government capital expenditure result in a 81.3006% positive impact on industrial output in the long-run. This called multiplier effect: how much a change in X can affect Y in the long-run equilibrium?

The analysis should involve the discussions in subsection 4.4, and also to reflect on the theory and literature review discussed in subsections 2.1 and 2.2. For example, Does the results of each coefficient agree with the literature review and/or the Keynesian theory of aggregate demand? How your results agree or disagree with the empirical literature of other authors?

Relatively, similar discussions with ECM for short-run results.

I suggest to combine the discussions in subsection 4.4 into subsections 4.2 and 4.3 for long-run and short-run results, to achieve an effective analysis.

Its important for the analysis to discuss the points raised above, as this will give the author a proper understanding on how to make a conclusion of his article and where to focus on his recommendations for the authority and decision-makers to provide proper economic advise! e.g. which coefficient/variable is more important economically for policy-makers to reform and invest in order to enhance agricultural and industrial outputs?

***C	1.350443	0.153535	8.795673	0.0000
------	----------	----------	----------	--------

## Model II

### Levels Equation

Dependent Variable: LAGR				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
**EXCH	0.001967	0.000884	2.225153	0.0357
*INF	0.010881	0.005888	1.847886	0.0770
***LGOV	1.033396	0.093645	11.03519	0.0000
RIR	-0.004246	0.007684	-0.552576	0.5857
***C	1.056526	0.220174	4.798591	0.0001

\* indicates 10% level of significance  
 \*\* indicates 5% level of significance  
 \*\*\* indicates 1% level of significance

Equations 12 and 13 which are the error correction models were estimated to show the speed of adjustments of the dependent variables to long equilibrium since there is a long-run relationship between the dependent and independent variables as shown in Table 5. The ECM values of -0.60 and -0.58 with a *p-value* of 0.00 for model I and II respectively means that any short-run deviation from the long-run equilibrium will adjust at 60 and 58 percent for model I and II respectively, per period. This means that it takes approximately one year and eight months for the dependent variables to adjust back to long run equilibrium after a deviation in both models.

**Commented [MF17]:** Is it Table 4 or Table 5 for the results of ECM?  
 Please correct the table number as this might confuse the readers!

**Commented [MF18]:** How the author came with the approximation of one year and eight months for the ECM to adjust into the long-run equilibrium? Please specify clearly to Scholars on how this figure is calculated!

### 4.3 Short Run Analysis

The coefficients of variables in equation 12 of the error correction model show that in the short run exchange depreciation at the current period and at lag 2 has a significant negative effect on industrial output with the coefficient of -0.001432 and -0.001765, respectively but a positive effect at lag 1. Inflation at lag 1 has a significant negative effect on industrial output with a coefficient of -0.00167. Government expenditure has a significant positive effect on industrial output in the current period and a negative in the previous period(lag 1). The real interest rate has a significant negative effect on industrial output in both current and previous periods with a coefficient of -0.005104, -0.004501, and -0.000974 for the current period, lag 1 and lag 2 respectively.

The coefficients of the variables in equation 13 show that the previous period's agricultural output at lag 2 has a significant negative effect on the current industrial sector output. Exchange rate depreciation at lag 1 has a negative effect on agricultural output with a coefficient of -0.000993. Government expenditure at lag 2 has a negative effect on the output of the agricultural sector with a coefficient of -0.159115. Inflation and real interest rates did not contribute significantly to the explanatory power of the model and hence were automatically dropped from the estimation of equation 13.

**Table 4: Error Correction Model**

**Model I**

ECM Regression				
Dependent Variable: $\Delta(LIND)$				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
*** $\Delta(EXCH)$	-0.001432	0.000289	-4.953108	0.0001
** $\Delta(EXCH(-1))$	0.000765	0.000370	2.068890	0.0511
*** $\Delta(EXCH(-2))$	-0.001765	0.000379	-4.659486	0.0001
$\Delta(INF)$	-0.000634	0.000500	-1.266785	0.2191
*** $\Delta(INF(-1))$	-0.001670	0.000445	-3.749716	0.0012
*** $\Delta(LGOV)$	0.176378	0.041055	4.296196	0.0003
*** $\Delta(LGOV(-1))$	-0.166058	0.052606	-3.156655	0.0048
*** $\Delta(RIR)$	-0.005104	0.000724	-7.051327	0.0000
*** $\Delta(RIR(-1))$	-0.004501	0.000710	-6.335269	0.0000

**Commented [MF19]:** Usually the coefficient of each variable in the estimated model/equation should be displayed in the table of results, even if some coefficients are not significant! Therefore, the author should display the results of inflation and real interest rates in Table 4 for Model II; because on academic and economic basis all regression results should be displayed for scholars and readers.

**Commented [MF20]:** Similarly, short-run analysis in subsection 4.3 are only descriptive.

Please refer to my remark above in subsection 4.2.

** $\Delta(\text{RIR}(-2))$	-0.000974	0.000397	-2.450915	0.0231
*** $\text{ECM}(-1)$	-0.609712	0.018145	-11.55773	0.0000
<b>R-squared</b>	0.881510			
<b>Adjusted R-squared</b>	0.835937			
<b>Durbin-Watson stat</b>	2.379451			

## Model II

### ECM Regression

Dependent Variable: $\Delta(\text{LAGR})$				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
$\Delta(\text{LAGR}(-1))$	0.176193	0.121191	1.453849	0.1589
* $\Delta(\text{LAGR}(-2))$	-0.203417	0.110329	-1.843741	0.0776
$\Delta(\text{EXCH})$	-0.000273	0.000376	-0.726735	0.4744
** $\Delta(\text{EXCH}(-1))$	-0.000993	0.000437	-2.273196	0.0323
$\Delta(\text{LGOV})$	0.032774	0.053437	0.613322	0.5454
$\Delta(\text{LGOV}(-1))$	-0.012654	0.054642	-0.231580	0.8188
*** $\Delta(\text{LGOV}(-2))$	-0.159110	0.053376	-2.980902	0.0065
*** $\text{ECM}(-1)$	-0.580608	0.024226	-7.867978	0.0000
<b>R-Squared</b>	0.697451			
<b>Adjusted R-Squared</b>	0.624422			
<b>Durbin-Watson stat</b>	2.068491			

\* indicates 10% level of significance

\*\* indicates 5% level of significance

\*\*\* indicates 1% level of significance

## 4.3 Post Estimation Tests

To be sure that our model result fulfills regression assumptions, the study proceeds to estimate the serial correlation test, model stability, and heteroscedasticity test all presented and discussed in this section.

## Model I

**Table .5:** Post Estimation Diagnostics

DIAGNOSTIC TESTS	Normality Test	Serial Correlation LM Test	Heteroskedasticity Test: Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey
Test Statistics	<i>JB Stat:</i> 1.50	<i>F-Stat:</i> 1.555953	<i>F-Stat:</i> 0.468454
P Values	0.47	0.2367	0.9318

## Model II


DIAGNOSTIC TESTS	Normality Test	Serial Correlation LM Test	Heteroskedasticity Test: Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey
Test Statistics	<i>JB Stat: 5.44</i>	<i>F-Stat: 1.067154</i>	<i>F-Stat: 1.841106</i>
P Values	0.065	0.3606	0.0982

The null hypothesis of the Normality test states that the error terms of the estimated model are normally distributed, that of the LM test states that the error terms are not serially correlated while the that of ARCH test states that the error terms are homoscedastic. The P values of the respective test show that the null hypothesis for the test cannot be rejected at a 5% level of significance. This confirms the fulfillment of the basic assumptions of regression analysis about the characteristics of the error term. Thus, the inferences drawn from the estimated model are reliable.


**Model Stability Test:** This test is a graphical representation involving a pair of straight lines at a 0.05 significance level with the null hypothesis that the regression equation is correctly specified. The decision rule is to accept the null hypothesis if the plotted CUSUM graph remains inside the straight lines, otherwise reject it. Now, since our graph is inside the straight line for the two models as shown below, we will accept the null hypothesis and conclude that the regression equation is correctly specified.

**Figure 2: Model Stability Test**

### Model I



### Model II



## 4.4 Discussion of Results

### Model I

#### Short Run Dynamics

**Exchange Rate Depreciation:** The negative coefficient (-0.001432) for current period exchange rate depreciation suggests that a depreciation of the exchange rate in the short run has a dampening effect on industrial output. This could indicate increased production costs or reduced competitiveness of domestic industries due to currency devaluation. Most of the machinery used in the Nigerian industries is imported and an exchange rate deterioration will

discourage production since more funds will be required to finish or continue production having used a lower exchange rate as a benchmark.

**Inflation:** The negative coefficient (-0.00167) of inflation at lag 1 implies that higher inflation levels in the previous period negatively impact current industrial output. This could reflect increased production costs and reduced consumer purchasing power affecting industrial demand.

**Government Capital Expenditure:** The positive coefficient of government expenditure on current industrial output suggests that higher government spending stimulates industrial production in the short run. However, the negative coefficient at lag 1 (-0.001765) indicates that previous period government expenditure may have diminishing or adverse effects on current industrial output, possibly due to delayed impacts or fiscal policy adjustments.

**Real Interest Rate:** The consistently negative coefficients (-0.005104 for the current period, -0.004501 for lag 1, and -0.000974 for lag 2) of real interest rates highlight the adverse impact of higher interest rates on industrial output. Higher real interest rates may discourage investment and borrowing, thereby constraining industrial growth.

### **Long Run Dynamics**

**Exchange Rate Depreciation:** The positive coefficient (0.003894) of exchange rate depreciation suggests that in the long run, a depreciation of the exchange rate positively impacts industrial output. This could imply improved export competitiveness, increased demand for domestic goods, or enhanced profitability for export-oriented industries.

**Inflation:** The positive coefficient (0.011712) of inflation indicates that higher inflation levels contribute positively to industrial output in the long run. This relationship may reflect increased consumer demand and nominal revenue growth for businesses during periods of inflation.

**Government Capital Expenditure:** The substantially positive coefficient (1.033396) of government capital expenditure underscores the significant role of public investment in fostering industrial output over time. Increased government spending on infrastructure and development projects can stimulate economic activity, boost demand for industrial goods, and enhance overall industrial productivity.

**Commented [MF21]:** Incorrect figure, where Table 3 shows a coefficient of 0.813006 for government capital expenditure for Model I.

**Real Interest Rate:** The non-significant effect of the real interest rate on industrial output in the long run (as mentioned) may suggest that investment decisions and economic behavior have adjusted to accommodate prevailing interest rate conditions. This finding implies that the cost of investment, despite being influenced by real interest rates, may not be a primary determinant of industrial output in the long term.

## Model II

### Short Run Dynamics

**Previous Period Agricultural Output:** The negative coefficient of agricultural output at lag 2 indicates a dampening effect of past agricultural performance on current agricultural sector output. A certain percentage of agricultural output usually serves as input for the following year's agricultural activities. Thus, low output in previous periods will have a dampening effect on current period output.

**Exchange Rate Depreciation:** The negative coefficient (-0.000993) for exchange rate depreciation at lag 1 suggests that a depreciation of the exchange rate in the previous period negatively influences current agricultural output. This could imply increased costs of imported inputs or reduced competitiveness of agricultural exports.

**Government Capital Expenditure:** The negative coefficient (-0.159115) of government expenditure at lag 2 implies that government spending in the preceding period has a negative

impact on current agricultural sector output. This could reflect inefficiencies or misallocation of government resources affecting agricultural productivity.

### Long Run Dynamics

**Exchange Rate Depreciation:** The positive coefficient (0.001967) of exchange rate depreciation suggests that a depreciated exchange rate contributes positively to agricultural output in the long run. This relationship may be attributed to improved competitiveness of agricultural exports or increased demand for domestic agricultural products in response to currency devaluation.

**Inflation:** Similar to its impact on industrial output, the positive coefficient (0.010881) of inflation indicates that higher inflation levels positively influence agricultural output over time. This relationship may reflect increased agricultural prices and revenues, stimulating production and investment in the agricultural sector.

**Government Capital Expenditure:** The significant positive coefficient (1.033396) of government capital expenditure highlights the crucial role of public investment in driving agricultural sector growth in the long run. Government investments in agricultural infrastructure, research, and development can enhance productivity, expand markets, and improve overall sector performance.

### 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study show that the impact of exchange rate depreciation on industrial and agricultural output is fairly similar as exchange rate depreciation has a negative effect on industrial and agricultural output in the short run and a positive effect in the long run. The short-run negative impact of exchange rate depreciation on both industrial and agricultural output suggests that in the immediate aftermath of a currency devaluation, these sectors

**Commented [MF22]:** The discussion in section 4.4 should refer to the table number for each coefficient. For example, the negative coefficient (-0.001432) in Table 5 for current period exchange rate depreciation suggests that ... and so on for each variable.

As discussed in my note above, the discussion in subsection 4.4 should be combined into subsections 4.2 and 4.3 for long-run and short-run results, respectively.

experience reduced output levels, likely due to increased costs of imported inputs and machinery, leading to higher production costs and decreased competitiveness of domestic industries. Similarly, in the agriculture sector, higher costs for imported fertilizers or equipment can constrain output.

The observation that certain variables initially show negative effects but turn positive in the long run reflects the dynamics of adjustment and adaptation in the economy. In the short run, factors like increased costs or reduced demand due to exchange rate changes might lead to lower output. However, in the long run, firms and farmers may adapt by finding alternative suppliers, adjusting production techniques, or exploring new markets. This adaptation process can gradually reverse the negative impacts observed in the short term, highlighting the flexibility and resilience of economic agents in responding to changing economic conditions. The findings of this study underscore the importance of considering both short-run dynamics and long-run adjustments in understanding the effects of exchange rate depreciation and other economic variables on industrial and agricultural output.

## 5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the findings of this study, the following are the policy recommendations:

1. The high exchange rate volatility needs to be checked to enable realistic forecasts and good decision-making. Given the negative short-term impact of exchange rate depreciation on both industrial and agricultural output, policymakers should focus on measures to stabilize and manage exchange rates during periods of depreciation. This can include interventions by central banks to moderate volatility and prevent abrupt depreciation that could disrupt economic activities in these sectors.
2. To leverage the potential positive effects of exchange rate depreciation in the long run, governments should prioritize structural reforms aimed at enhancing productivity and competitiveness in industrial and agricultural sectors. This could involve investments in technology, infrastructure, and human capital development.

**Commented [MF23]:** This article did not test the volatility of exchange rate on industrial and agricultural output; the ARDL regression mainly tested the relationship between the time-series of the variables; volatility tests are different. I suggest to rephrase the sentence and focus on the results and analysis conducted throughout the article for your recommendations.

## COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

**Authors have declared that they have no known competing financial interests OR non-financial interests OR personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.**

## REFERENCES

- Akinlo O.O. and Lawal, Q. A. (2015). Impact of exchange rate on industrial production in Nigeria 1986-2010. *International Business and Management*, 10 (1), 104-110.
- Akpan, S.B. (2012). Analysis of food crop output volatility in agricultural policy program regimes in Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, 2(1), 34 -67.
- Chand, S. (n.d.). Mechanism of absorption approach to the balance of payments adjustments. Retrieved September 3, 2021 from: <https://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/notes/macroeconomics/mechanism-of-absorption-approach-to-the-balance-of-payments-adjustment/31245>
- Chang, A.H. and Tan, E.U. (2008). Fixed versus Flexible exchange rates, Preliminaries of a Turn-of-Millennium Rematch. Nimeo, University of Maryland.
- Fama, E. F. (1984). Forward and spot exchange rates. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 14(3), 319-338.
- Effiong, U., Arinze, N., and Okon, J. (2022). Monetary and Fiscal Policy Interactions and Exchange Rate Movement in Nigeria. *International Journal of Novel Research in Marketing Management and Economics*. Vol. 9(2). 42-64.
- Effiong, U., and Okon, J. (2020). The Effectiveness of Monetary and Fiscal Policies in Stimulating Real Sector Output Growth in Nigeria: The Need for Monetary-Fiscal Coordination. *American Journal of Economics and Business Management*. 3(5). 94-127.
- Ekundayo, P. M., Olorunfemi, Y. A. and Ismail, A. F. (2019). Macroeconomic implications of exchange rate depreciation: the Nigerian experience. *Managing global transitions*. DOI: 10.26493/1854-6935.16.235-258
- Inyang, N., Effiong, U and Okon, J. (2020). Nigeria Diversification Agenda and Economic Growth: The Role of Agriculture. *World Journal of Innovative Research*. 9(3):13-20.
- Iwegbu, O. and Nwaogwugwu, I. C. (2019). Effect of Exchange Rate Shock on Key Sectors of the Nigerian Economy. In: Dauda, R.O.S. Akinleye, S.O. Balogun, E.D. (Ed.): Leading Issues in Macroeconomic Stabilisation and Financial Development, A Festschrift in Honour of Professor Oluwatayo Fakiyesi, Unilag Press & Bookshop Ltd., Lagos, pp. 507-533

- Lartey, E. (2007). Capital inflows and the real exchange rate: an empirical study of sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of International Trade and Economic Development*, 16(3), 337–57.
- Jhinghan H. L. (2004). *Macroeconomics*. New Delhi: Konark Publishers.
- Mamun, A., Chowdhury, A. H. and Basher, S. (2013). ‘Effects of Exchange Rate Variation on Price Level and Output Growth in Bangladesh.’ *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 4 (6): 205–12.
- Mankiw, N. G. (2009). *Macroeconomics*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Mengistu, A. A. and Lee, J. (2013). ‘Examining the Effects of Currency Depreciation on Trade Balance in Selected Asian Economies.’ *International Journal of Global Business* 7 (1): 59–76.
- Mishkin, F. S. (1996). ‘The Channels of Monetary Transmission: Lessons for Monetary.’ NBER Working Paper 5454, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, ma.
- Oduola, A.F., and Akinlo, A.E. (2001). Output, inflation, and exchange rate in developing countries: An application to Nigeria. *The Development Economies*, XXXIX-2, 199-222.
- Ogunmuyiwa, M. and Adelowokan, O (2018). Measuring the impact of exchange rate on industrial output in Nigeria. *European Journal of Marketing and Economics* DOI: 10.26417/ejm.v1i2.p87-93
- Okon, J., Joshua, N, Arinze, P and Effiong, U. (2021). Is the Inflation Problem in Nigeria Unsolvable? *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Method*. 9 (11), 995-1008.
- Rostow, W. W. (1959). The stages of economic growth: *The Economic history review second series, Vol. XII*, No. 1 Blackwell publishing
- Sanusi, J. O. (2004, February 24). Exchange rate mechanism: the current Nigerian experience. Retrieved August 2, 2021 from: <https://www.cbn.gov.ng/OUT/SPEECHES/2004/GOVADD-24FEB.PDF>
- Udoh, E., & Egwaikhide, F. O. (2008). Exchange rate volatility, inflation uncertainty and foreign direct investment in Nigeria and Botswana, *Journal of Economic Review*, 5(7), 14-31.
- Umeh, J.C. and Ameh, A. A. (2010). The Effect of Exchange Rate Fluctuations on the Nigerian Manufacturing Sector, *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(14), 2994 – 2998.
- Waziri, S. I., Nor, N. M., Mukhtar, U. & Muktar, B.G. (2017). Export of Agricultural Raw Materials, Exchange Rate and Economic Growth in Nigeria: An ARDL Approach to Cointegration, *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 8(22), 76 – 86.