

Denys V. Lypnytskyi,*PhD in Economics, application architect, technical trainer*
i-Klass Center LLCE-mail: denis.lipnitsky@i-klass.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4616-7936>;**Polina D. Lypnytska**

Up2Date Learn Online Courses

E-mail: kumpersina@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1722-1697>

MONEY SUPPLY IMPACT ON INVESTMENT AND GDP: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The question of how the changes in money supply influence investment and GDP have been studied intensively in recent history. However, not all aspects of this impact are sufficiently researched. In particular, the "new normality" (that has evolved recently) limits the use of well-known classical concepts and models in monetary policy, especially for emerging economies to which Ukraine belongs. Thus, the subject of this study was to assess the relationship between monetary aggregates, investment, and GDP by the world economic data analysis using mathematical statistics.

As the information base for the study, the World Bank official statistics were taken (including broad money, gross capital formation, and GDP). More than 71% of all investigated countries showed a significant correlation between M3 and gross investment. The issue of how the strength of this relationship depends on the level of socio-economic development was investigated. Classification of countries was carried out using the "nearest neighbors" method in a two-dimensional feature space, namely, per capita income and correlation tightness. The analysis showed that 79% of all countries fall into the class with a proven high correlation. Moreover, their level of wealth and development was irrelevant.

A cluster analysis of countries was fulfilled in the chosen feature space using the "mean shift" method. With the help of this method, all countries have been distributed into five clusters with different socio-economic conditions and an accuracy of 91%. Among them, there was a group of countries highly sensitive to change in monetization, up to extremely negative economic impacts.

The study helped to conclude that, regardless of economic development, GDP benefits from an increase in the money supply. Although this factor is considered necessary, it is nevertheless not sufficient for economic growth, especially in the time of the fourth industrial revolution, when the government has to play a more active and complex role in accelerating national technological development.

Keywords: money supply, investment, GDP, monetization, correlation, cluster analysis.

JEL: G18, G28, C12, C22

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the world economy has faced two great challenges – the global financial crisis of 2007-2008 and the COVID-19 pandemic. To mitigate their impact, the world-leading monetary authorities lowered interest rates to the histo-

rical minimum and took non-traditional measures. This new monetary policy helped to maintain financial stability and support business activity. However, as a result, the top developed countries fell into a "liquidity trap" with interest rates close to zero and unprece-

© D. V. Lypnytskyi, P. D. Lypnytska, 2022

mented public debt raising. Such a policy means, that the central banks and monetary authorities directly finance government spending (the orthodox economic theory forbids it) via the constant expansion of the monetary base (Damiano Sandri, 2022). In such circumstances, the emerging economies faced new problems, including a strong need to maintain economic growth together with a high probability of increasing exchange rates and imported inflation.

The *situation is getting even* more complicated since the world is experiencing the fundamental transformations brought by the 4th Industrial Revolution. Many of its technologies are still in the initial phase, which means that further steps would require active government support (Vishnevsky, 2022), including new monetary policy measures. In this regard, an increase in money supply, long and cheap liquidity provision might have a positive impact on investment and real GDP growth. Whether this is the case and what preconditions are required for a positive scenario, is a matter of great theoretical and practical importance.

The question of how the changes in money supply influence investment and GDP have been studied intensively in recent history. However, not all aspects of this impact have been sufficiently researched. In particular, the "new normality", that has evolved in recent years, limits the use of well-known classical concepts and models in monetary policy, especially for emerging economies to which Ukraine belongs.

In this regard, the subject of the study is to assess the relationship between monetary aggregates, investment, and GDP by the world economic data analysis using mathematical statistics. The goal is to identify the elements of this relationship and describe their differences for various economies at the current stage of world development.

The article is structured as follows. First, it presents a brief predecessor studies overview and substantiates the research methods. Then the analysis of the relationship between money supply, investment, and GDP in

different countries is given. The applied statistical methods are used in this part. After discussing the results, the paper makes inferences, draws conclusions, and suggests directions for further research.

Among the different goals that economic policy pursues, the most important one is GDP growth, which is highly dependent on many factors. If we put aside for a while the influence of commodity markets, labor migration, innovation, etc., then the money supply will perhaps have the strongest influence on GDP. Although as shown below, a change in the money supply directly or indirectly affects the discarded factors, causing even more complex effects. And the main transmission mechanisms of influence are aggregate demand and investments (gross volume and structure).

The impact of money supply on GDP growth is non-linear. The rise in the money supply (if it is uncontrolled) leads to inflation, which, by creating additional costs for economic entities leads to a reduction in working capital, income, and investment. At the same time, distortions of information caused by inflation provoke systematic errors in making economic and, especially, investment decisions. As a result, structural problems in the economy get worse. Negative dynamics of GDP may happen as a result.

It seems that the containment of emissions and the "sterilization" of the money supply should curb inflation and promote GDP growth. But the balance between surplus and scarcity is very delicate. A lack of money supply causes no less painful consequences, than money excess. This issue will be discussed in more detail below. For now, it suffices to mention that the presence of slight inflation driven by the growth of monetary aggregates is beneficial for the economy (Adam, Weber, 2019), and under certain conditions, a negative non-linear relationship between inflation and unemployment can be observed (Phillips, 1958).

Since interdependencies between GDP and other macroeconomic factors are complex, economic policy simultaneously uses

many levers of control. In addition to GDP growth, they are moderate inflation, control of unemployment, limiting the budget deficit, and maintaining an acceptable trade balance. The multidimensional criterion of success,

which takes into account the above-mentioned factors, has been called the "magic square". It usually demonstrates the impossibility of achieving all four goals simultaneously (Fig. 1).




Figure 1 – "Magic square"

Source: Kaldor, 1971.

Therefore, economic policy is often forced to count on higher priority tasks, sacrificing the rest. During a severe economic downturn, inflation and budget deficits are usually sacrificed to recover and accelerate GDP growth. The entire quantitative easing policy pursued by the United States is proof of this. Low-interest rates and "helicopter" money allowed the US to restore stock indices and return GDP growth, but at the cost of inflation rising. The consumer price index in the United States increased by 2021 to a record level for 40 years – 6,8% (Inflation in the US accelerated to a record since 1982, 2021).

However, as you know, *quad licet iovi, non licet bovi*. The financial authorities of other countries (Russia, China, Brazil, etc.), on the contrary, have kept the interest rates at a high level since 2008. Their surge in inflation was mainly caused by non-emission factors. And despite the measures taken, the cancellation of the next stage of quantitative easing in the leading countries was followed by the expected outflow of capital from less developed economies to the USA, the UK,

and Central Europe (Zaiko, 2015). The external debt of individual countries like Ukraine, Turkey, India, and some others increased significantly. The monetization of these economies has suffered a decline. It resulted in a natural "sterilization" of their finances.

Regardless of its cause, "money hunger" is considered by many economists no less evil than uncontrolled inflation (Krugman, 2010). But despite this, people continue to believe in inflation targeting as the most useful vaccine against any economic disease. And the reason is not only the apparent simplicity of this recipe but its imposition by the world's leading financial institutions.

Inflation targeting performed through regulating monetary aggregates and/or discount rates is considered by economists differently. The character of their assessment largely depends on the state of the economy under study (Stiglitz, 2008). For technologically and economically developed countries with huge capital stock, such targeting may positively impact GDP growth. On the contrary, for less developed countries with low capi-

talization or suppressed aggregate demand, statistical data prove the neutrality of the targeting policy or even its negative impact on GDP.

At the same time, despite the statistical analysis, the very logic of economic mechanisms suggests that the excessive pressure on inflation by restraining the money supply causes a corresponding pressure on demand and investment. As a counterargument, it is argued that it will be risky to allow inflation to rise to 6% and above. Beyond this line, price volatility, which is difficult to control, begins (Perevyshina, 2017).

However, even if a "green corridor" is set within 4-5%, effective targeting is still difficult to implement. In particular, the macroeconomic information required for the regulator is distributed unevenly over time. Prices, production statistics, budget revenue, and similar data come to decision-making centers in different periods, which causes policy inaccuracies (Kartaev, 2017; Stiglitz, 2008, May 6). Delays in the arrival of information lead targeting to the blind pursuit of an elusive target. And the most likely consequence of this is the excessive "sterilization" of the money supply up to the aforementioned "money hunger".

The negative consequences of long-term compaction of monetary aggregates are numerous. Some researches show that "money hunger" is especially aggressive towards the industries with a complex technological structure, and a high share of added value (Blinov, 2015). As a result, the first consequence of money's "evaporation" from the economy is the primitivization of its structure, which is obviously the case in Ukraine.

The monetary deficit also leads to a simplification of the structure of households' consumption. The savings, and as a result, investments are going down. Investment strategies also boil down to the minimum need for survival, ignoring innovative, high-tech, and, especially, venture capital assets.

The reduction of high-tech industries and jobs causes an outflow of labor resources from the most promising sectors of the economy. As a result, labor migration may in-

crease, and specifically, the outflow of the most qualified staff. All these factors, multiply reinforcing each other, cause multiple effects. The impact of the real money supply contraction on the decline in GDP becomes non-linear. Its rise influence on GDP growth is also non-linear. But how exactly it works is a separate question.

Econometric analysis

Problem formulation

S. Blinov (Blinov, 2015, p. 9) describes the reasons why GDP growth requires not only recovery but an outstripping growth of the money supply. According to the author, "linear growth of real GDP requires exponential growth of real money supply." Among the reasons for this phenomenon, there is the structural complexity of the economy. It means that an increase in money supply leads first to a rise in the number of transactions required to recreate (or form) this complex structure. Only then, to an increase in value-added, which is only a part of the total cost of transactions. Thus, figuratively speaking, monetary resources first fill all the buffers and channels of the "reclamation system" of the economy, and only then lead to "fertility".

This somewhat simplified logic ignores technological development factors and life cycles of technologies. Which is of strong importance in the time of the 4th Industrial Revolution. Not only an increase in the money supply and aggregate demand can secure the growth of breakthrough technologies. It is especially the truth for the microchips industry, which is the base of the modern digital economy. The microchips industry's development requires many other conditions and actions that go beyond the scope of the monetary policy.

Nevertheless, under certain conditions, the mentioned effects (Blinov, 2015) can take place. If we consider the state of the Ukrainian economy against the background of the problems discussed, we can get a good illustration of what has been said.

The trend of the monetary aggregate M3 of Ukraine is shown in the chart below in Fig.

2 (National Bank of Ukraine). Fig. 3 also shows an increase in the inflation rates and prices for construction work, which illustrates




Figure 2 – **Broad money index (Ukraine)**
Source: National Bank of Ukraine.

From the illustrations above it is obvious, that the fall in the real money supply was about 10% between 2015 and 2020. Against the background of a long-term decline in real M3, its notable growth happened only in recent years (about 20% in 2020), while the inflation rate was much higher throughout the entire period under consideration.

The correspondence between the money supply and the productivity of the economy is

the inflation of investment opportunities (Ministry of Finance of Ukraine).




Figure 3 – **Inflation and construction works price base indexes (Ukraine)**
Source: Ministry of Finance of Ukraine.

usually measured by the monetization coefficient (Pshinko, Myamlin, 2012):

$$K_m = M / GDP,$$

where M – monetary supply aggregate, M2 or M3 (broad money);

GDP – gross domestic product.

Following the formula, monetization coefficients have been calculated for Ukrainian and several foreign economies. The results are shown in Table. 1.

Table 1 – **Global monetization coefficients (2020), %**

Ukraine	Russia	Japan	India	China	USA	Brazil
44	60	258	73	205	95	96

Source: compiled by authors.

It is worth mentioning, that the GDP boosting by expanding the money supply is a task far from having a simple solution for a particular economy. It is obvious that the monetization of the Ukrainian economy is insufficient for long-term and productive economic growth, even more, for the increasing complexity of the domestic economy. But the question remains: What coefficient might be considered sufficient?

Take Japan and China, for example, where monetization coefficients are 258% and 205%, respectively. Both of these countries do not have a liquidity crisis. However, it is only in China where the cash flow turns the "millstones" of economic growth. In Japan, the problems, that piled up in the economy and finance during the "lost decade" (Fumio Hayashi, 2001), inhibit now investment activity even in presence of a significant increase in liquidity. China, whose investment channels

are more straightforward than its neighbor's, is showing more progress. However, China also runs the risk of facing similar difficulties in the future due to accumulating "bad debts" (China's potential loss from NPLs estimated at \$1 trillion, 2016).

To what extent should monetary aggregates be built up without excessive inflation? F. Kartaeв, says that the level of harmless inflation can be "a little more than 10% for developing economies" (Kartaeв, 2019). Then, he insists that inflation must be kept substantially lower even for such countries. The author favors inflation targeting over money supply expansion, insisting that the long-term impact on GDP growth from the first is more robust than from the second. Thus, the opinions of F. Kartaeв and S. Blinov are opposed.

Some authors study the differences in monetary policy and its impact on inflation and GDP growth for countries with distinct economic or socio-cultural conditions. F. Kartaeв explores the countries with different ethnolinguistic diversity (Kartaeв, 2018). O. Klochkova analyzes inflation in countries with different levels of economic freedom (Klochkova, 2017). However, these studies do not provide any universal conclusions.

Thus, the following points were taken as a theoretical basis for the study: firstly, the hypothesis concerning the positive impact of the expansion of the real money supply and monetization of the economy on the growth of investment and, as a result, GDP growth. Secondly, the alleged ambiguity of the criteria and approaches for stimulating GDP growth by "calming down" exchange rates and inflation. Thirdly, there is a wide variety of economies of individual countries, which highly differ in sectoral structure, trade balance, debt burden, global cooperation, etc. This diversity, however, is desirable to be reduced to certain patterns. Taking into account the foregoing facts and hypotheses, a statistical analysis of the World Bank data time series was conducted (the World Bank, 2020). Its results are shown and explained below.

Relationship analysis: the real money supply and investment

As the information base for the study, the official statistics of the World Bank were taken (including M3 – broad money, gross capital formation, GDP, and population for individual countries) for the period 2006–2020. The period was chosen deliberately from the year before the real-estate bubble explosion to the year when the "COVID-19" crisis began. The influence of the latter one on the world economy has not yet ceased, and in certain markets, for example, electronics, it is only increasing these days (Kelion, 2021, February 5).

The calculations were accomplished in Python programming language using the statistics and machine learning library (Scikit-learn). The code and its execution results are given as an interactive notebook and are available at the following link (Lypnytska, GitHub).

By the authors cited above (Stiglitz, 2008; Blinov, 2015) the relationship between monetary aggregates and GDP is considered to be confirmed. Investments are acknowledged as an intermediate agent for such influence. However, the impact of monetization on the investment itself has not been sufficiently and quantitatively studied by them. Therefore, as a complement to the above-mentioned works, the impact of M3 money aggregate on gross capital formation was studied (to isolate the investment influence on GDP growth and examine it in its pure form).

The relationship between broad money and investment was measured by computing the Pearson correlation coefficients (All of Statistics, 2004) for all countries from the World Bank report. Then the empirical threshold for the Pearson coefficient was set at 65%. This threshold helped to separate the countries with a proven relationship between broad money and investment activity. Table 2 below shows a fragment of the top list, sorted by the correlation strength.

Table 2 – TOP countries by the correlation between M3 and gross capital formation (2020)

Country	Correlation coefficients	GDP per capita, USD
Kazakhstan	0,956351	26 352
Sweden	0,956661	52 850
Peru	0,958855	12 854
Cambodia	0,962369	4 389
Turkey	0.963198	28 385
Kyrgyzstan	0,971727	5 258
S.Korea	0,974348	42 719
India	0,983017	6 717
China	0,992802	16 411
USA	0,869843	60 162
UK	0,835022	41 627

Source: compiled by authors.

The list turned out to be quite heterogeneous. In addition to India, China, the United States, and the UK, it includes some countries from a completely different division, like Peru and Cambodia. However, 71% of all investigated countries showed a significant relationship between broad money and gross investment. The histogram of Pearson correlation coefficients (Fig. 4) indicates that




Figure 4 – Histogram of correlation between broad money and gross capital formation

Source: compiled by authors.

The Turkey example below illustrates this relationship, including the linear regression equation shown in Fig. 6 (the coefficient of determination equals 71%). This judgment

most countries naturally fall into the "core", that is, a group with the highest degree of correlation. And if the observation of time series for individual countries itself only displays a probable similarity in M3 and gross investment tendencies (Fig. 5), then regression analysis proves the existence of a significant relationship between them.




Figure 5 – Broad money and gross capital formation (Turkey)

Source: compiled by authors.

applies equally to all countries that have passed the determined threshold of 65% for the Pearson correlation coefficient. Thus, the relationship between the two factors is proven.

Further analysis and discussion

It is believed that the influence of the money supply on investment and via investment on GDP depends significantly on the level of the country's economic development. In less developed and poor countries, the expansion of the money supply can only cause excessive inflation and thus harm the GDP. Thus, the practicality of inflation targeting is supposed to be confirmed.

To clarify this hypothesis, the next stage of the study was accomplished. The "nearest neighbors" were chosen as an analytical method (Hastie, 2017). The classification of countries was carried out using it. As a result,




Figure 6 – Regression analysis (Turkey)
Source: compiled by authors.

However, most poor countries also belong to that class. The figure shows them belonging to the dense cluster of blue dots in the lower right corner. At the same time, some middle-income countries (as well as poor ones) are found to belong to the class with a low correlation between broad money and gross investment. Therefore, we can talk about the incorrectness of the hypothesis that the growth of the money supply has a positive effect on investment and GDP growth only for developed and rich countries.

The vast majority of the analyzed countries ended up in the class with a provable correlation regardless of their wealth and development. The share of such countries constitutes 79%. On the contrary, among the re-

the countries were separated in a two-dimensional feature space. Namely, per capita income (1) and the tightness (Pearson coefficient) of the relationship between broad money and gross capital formation (2). The outcomes of the classification are shown in Fig. 7.

The division of countries into two groups was done with 91% accuracy. The fulfilled statistical analysis (together with inferences drawn) partly conflicts with the opinions of the above-mentioned authors. As expected, countries with the highest GDP per capita ended up in a strongly correlated class (blue labels in Fig. 7).




Figure 7 – "Nearest neighbors" classification
Source: compiled by authors.

maining 21%, there are countries with predominantly middle and low per capita income.

To expand the study, countries cluster analysis was executed in the same feature space. These heterogeneous indicators (GDP per capita and correlation coefficient) were also normalized, as in the classification method shown above. The "mean shift" method was applied for this cluster analysis (Comaniciu, Meer, 2002). The internal parameters of the "mean shift" method were selected based on cross-validation, maximizing the accuracy of separating the countries in the feature space. The results of the analysis are illustrated in Fig. 8. The countries were divided into five clusters, marked in the figure in different

colors (with the centers of the clusters marked with larger circles).




Figure 8 – "Mean shift" clustering

Source: compiled by authors.

The analysis showed that the largest group, marked in blue in the lower right corner, included 78% of the total number of countries. And these are precisely the countries with a relatively low level of GDP per capita but at the same time a high correlation between broad money and investment. For such countries, the increase in monetization is strongly linked with GDP growth.

Economic logic itself suggests that the low savings ratio and weak financial institutions in such countries make them very susceptible to money supply decrease and decline in monetization up to very negative consequences for their economy. These countries' group includes India, Turkey, China, Brazil, Mexico, and several other Latin American countries.

Rich countries in the upper right quadrant of the figure (consisting of two relatively small clusters) have shown, as expected, a strong positive relationship between the broad money supply and investment growth. In contrast, the green cluster (low correlation and low per capita income) in the lower-left quadrant predictably includes countries ravaged by war or poverty, such as Ethiopia and Libya.

However, there is also a small group of countries where the relationship between M3

and gross investment does not depend on wealth. They are represented by the red cluster in the figure. Among the countries in this group, there are Japan, Switzerland, and Panama. These are three clear examples of how different economic destinies brought them to this neighborhood. Japan is still unable to resurrect the economy and the financial institutions' normal functioning after the "lost decade". The other two countries are offshore havens whose economies are weakly dependent on domestic monetary policy.

Conclusions. Money is not just a "blanket" thrown over the economy to warm it up. They can and do work, but only with varying degrees of success. Monetary policy is the tool that has helped overcome two global crises, but it also created new problems, namely, uncontrolled price increases and "financial bubbles" inflating.

As shown by the statistical analysis, money is important, but it is not always the decisive factor for the growth of investment and GDP. Moreover (and it should be emphasized), this conclusion does not directly depend on the level of economic development. In most world countries (both developed and developing), a strong relationship exists between real money supply and investment. This relationship leads to GDP growth. But at the same time, there are certain rich economies, where the growth of the real money supply is weakly related to the increase of investments. There are some cases, where the dependence is almost functional (but until the possibilities of extensive growth are exhausted).

Despite the importance of monetary variables, key factors that influence the "real money supply-investment-GDP" chain should be investigated outside the monetary sphere. The conclusion has long been known but is relatively new for the current conditions. The sustained expansion of the monetary base and the growth of the real money supply do matter. But they cannot by themselves solve the fundamental problems of modernizing economic institutions and bridging technological gaps. Concerning the Ukrainian economy, the regulator has to maintain a stable growth of

the real money supply. It is essential for solving the accumulated problems, providing that the government creates preconditions for accelerating the national technical and technological development and raising the general level of the economy. Such complex rules for economic policy should be considered a priority for further research in these subject areas.

Література

- Блинов С. (2015). Реальные деньги и экономический рост. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*. URL: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/67256>
- Вишневикий В. (2022). Цифрові технології та проблеми розвитку промисловості. *Економіка України*. № 1. С. 47-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/economyukr.2022.01.047>
- Зайко Н. (2015). Количественное смягчение в США: последствия для развивающихся стран. *Региональные проблемы преобразования экономики*. № 6 (56). С. 96-100.
- Индекс цен на строительные работы. *Минфин*. URL: <https://index.minfin.com.ua/economy/index/buildprice/> (дата звернення: 28.12.2021).
- Инфляция в США ускорила до рекорда с 1982 года. (2021, 10 декабря). *Экономическая правда*. URL: <https://www.epravda.com.ua/rus/news/2021/12/10/680569/> (дата звернення: 25.12.2021).
- Картаев Ф. (2019). Как инфляционное таргетирование влияет на экономический рост. *Эконс*. URL: <https://econs.online/articles/opinions/kak-inflyatsionnoe-tar-getirovanie-vliyaet-na-rost/> (дата звернення: 22.11.2021).
- Картаев Ф. (2018). Оценка влияния монетарной политики на экономический рост для различных групп стран. *Финансы: теория и практика*. Т. 22. № 1. С. 50-63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26794/2587-5671-2018-22-1-50-63>
- Картаев Ф. (2017). Полезно ли инфляционное таргетирование для экономического роста? *Вопросы экономики*. № 2. С. 62-74. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32609/0042-8736-2017-2-62-74>
- Келион Л. (2021, 5 февраля). В мире не хватает чипов. При чем здесь коронавирус и что теперь будет с электроникой. *BBC*. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/russian/news-55950090> (дата звернення: 22.11.2021).
- Клочкова О. (2017). Моделирование влияния инфляции на экономический рост для различных по уровню экономической свободы стран. *Экономическая политика*. Т. 12. № 5. С. 22-41.
- Национальный банк Украины. URL: <https://bank.gov.ua>
- Переышина Е.А. (2016). Влияние инфляции на темпы экономического роста. *Финансы и кредит*. № 9. С. 18-30.
- Потенциальный убыток Китая от невозвратных кредитов оценили в \$1 трлн. (2016). *РБК*. URL: <https://www.rbc.ru/finances/06/05/2016/572c79239a7947861367effd> (дата звернення: 25.11.2021).
- Пшинько А. Н., Мямлин В. В., Мямлин С. В. (2012). Влияние скорости обращения денежной массы на эффективность национальной экономики. *Наука и прогресс транспорта. Вестник Днепропетровского национального университета железнодорожного транспорта*. № 42. С. 300-311.
- Стиглиц Дж. (2008). Таргетирование инфляции: Испытания реальностью. *Вести*. № 88. URL: <https://elitetrader.ru/index.php?newsid=11988> (дата звернення: 25.11.2021).
- Adam K., Weber H. (2019). Optimal Trend Inflation. *American Economic Review*. Vol. 109. No 2. P. 702-737. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.20171066>
- All of Statistics: A Concise Course in Statistical Inference (2004). Springer. New York. 434p.
- Comaniciu D., Meer P. (2002). Mean shift: a robust approach toward feature space analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 603-619. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/34.1000236>

- Damiano Sandri. Monetary Finance: Do Not Touch, or Handle with Care? Itai Agur, Damien Capelle, Giovanni Dell'Ariccia. International Monetary Fund. URL: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Departmental-Papers-Policy-Papers/Issues2022/01/11/Monetary-Finance-Do-Not-Touch-or-Handle-with-Care-464862> (дата звернення: 11.01.2022).
- Fumio Hayashi (2001). The 1990s in Japan: A Lost Decade. *University of Tokyo*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1006/redy.2001.0149>.
- Hastie T. (2017). The Elements of Statistical Learning. Springer. New York. 745 p.
- Kaldor N. (1971) Conflicts in National Economic Objectives. *Economic Journal*. Vol. 81, Iss. 321. P. 1-16.
- Krugman P. (2010, August 2). Why Is Deflation Bad? *The New York Times*. URL: <https://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/08/02/why-is-deflation-bad/> (дата звернення: 20.10.2021).
- Lypnytska P. InvestM3World. *GitHub*. URL: <https://github.com/Polinden/InvestM3World.git> (дата звернення: 25.12.2021).
- Phillips A. W. (1958, November). The Relation Between Unemployment and the Rate of Change of Money Wage Rates in the United Kingdom, 1861-1957. *Economica*. P. 283-299.
- Scikit-learn. URL: <https://scikit-learn.org> (дата звернення: 23.12.2021).
- Stiglitz J. (2008). The Failure of Inflation Targeting. *Project Syndicate*. URL: <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-failure-of-inflation-targeting> (дата звернення: 22.11.2021).
- The World bank. URL: <https://www.worldbank.org> (дата звернення: 25.12.2021).
- <https://doi.org/10.15407/economyukr.2022.01.047> [in Ukrainian].
- Zaiko, N. (2015). Quantitative Easing in the United States: Implications for Developing Countries. *Regional problems of economic transformation*, 6 (56), pp. 96-100 [in Russian].
- Price index for construction works. Ministry of Finance of Ukraine. Retrieved from <https://index.minfin.com.ua/economy/index/buildprice/>
- Inflation in the USA accelerated to a record since 1982 (2021, December 10). *Economic truth*. Retrieved from <https://www.epravda.com.ua/rus/news/2021/12/10/680569/> [in Russian].
- Kartaev, F. (2019). How inflation targeting influences economic growth. *Ekons*. Retrieved from <https://econs.online/articles/opinions/kak-inflyatsionnoe-targetirovanie-vliyaet-na-rost/> [in Russian].
- Kartaev, F. (2018). Assessment of the impact of monetary policy on economic growth for various groups of countries. *Finance: theory and practice*, 22 (1). pp. 50-63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26794/2587-5671-2018-22-1-50-63> [in Russian].
- Kartaev, F. (2017). Is inflation targeting good for economic growth? *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, 2, pp. 62-74. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32609/0042-8736-2017-2-62-74> [in Russian].
- Kelion, L. (2021, February 5). The world is running out of chips. What does the coronavirus have to do with it and what will happen to electronics now? *BBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/russian/news-55950090> [in Russian].
- Klochkova, O. (2017). Modeling the impact of inflation on economic growth for countries with different levels of economic freedom. *Economic policy*, 12 (5), pp. 22-41.
- National Bank of Ukraine. Retrieved from <https://bank.gov.ua>.
- Perevshina, E.A. (2017). Influence of inflation on the pace of economic growth. *Finance and credit*, 9, pp. 18-30 [in Russian].
- China's Potential Loss From NPLs Estimated At \$1 Trillion (2016). *RBC*. Retrieved

References

- Blinov, S. (2015). Real money and economic growth. Munich Personal RePEc Archive. Retrieved from <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/67256> [in Russian].
- Vishnevsky, V. (2022). Digital technologies and problems of industrial development. *Economics of Ukraine*, 1, pp. 47-66. DOI:

- from <https://www.rbc.ru/finances/06/05/2016/572c79239a7947861367effd>
- Pshinko, A., Myamlin, V., & Myamlin, S. (2012). Influence of the velocity of circulation of the money supply on the efficiency of the national economy. *Science and progress of transport. Bulletin of the Dnepropetrovsk National University of Railway Transport*, 42, pp. 300-311 [in Russian].
- Stiglitz, J. (2008, May 6). The Failure of Inflation Targeting. Project Syndicate. Retrieved from <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-failure-of-inflation-targeting> [in Russian].
- Adam, K., & Weber, H. (2019). Optimal Trend Inflation. *American Economic Review*, 109 (2), pp. 702-737. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.20171066>
- All of Statistics: A Concise Course in Statistical Inference. (2004). *Springer*. New York. P. 434.
- Comaniciu, D., Meer, P. (2002). Mean Shift: A Robust Approach Toward Feature Space Analysis. *EEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 24(5), pp. 603-619. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/34.1000236>
- Damiano, Sandri, Itai Agur, Damien Capelle, Giovanni Dell'Ariccia (2022). Monetary Finance: Do Not Touch, or Handle with Care? *International Monetary Fund*. Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Departmental-Papers-Policy-Papers/Issues/2022/01/11/Monetary-Finance-Do-Not-Touch-or-Handle-with-Care-464862>
- Fumio Hayashi (2001). The 1990s in Japan: A Lost Decade. *The University of Tokyo*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1006/redo.2001.0149>.
- Hastie, T. (2017). *The Elements of Statistical Learning*. Springer. New York. P. 745.
- Kaldor, N. (1971). Conflicts in National Economic Objectives. *Economic Journal*, 81 (321), pp. 1-16.
- Krugman, P. (2010). Why Is Deflation Bad? *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/08/02/why-is-deflation-bad/>
- Lypnytska, P. InvestM3World. *GitHub*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/Polinden/InvestM3World>
- Phillips, A.W. (1958). The Relation Between Unemployment and the Rate of Change of Money Wage Rates in the United Kingdom, 1861-1957. *Economica*. pp. 283-299.
- Scikit-learn. Retrieved from <https://scikit-learn.org/>
- Stiglitz, J. (2008). Inflation Targeting: A Test of Reality. *News №. 88*. Retrieved from <https://elitetrader.ru/index.php?newsid=11988> [in Russian].
- The World Bank. Retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org>

Денис Володимирович Липницький,

канд. екон. наук, архітектор додатків, технічний тренер

i-Klass, навчальний центр

вул. Шота Руставелі, 39/41, м. Київ, 01033, Україна

E-mail: d.lipnitsky@i-klass.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4616-7936>;

Поліна Денисівна Липницька

навчальний онлайн центр «Up2Date»

E-mail: kumpersina@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1722-1697>

ВПЛИВ ГРОШОВОЇ МАСИ НА ІНВЕСТИЦІЇ ТА ВВП: СТАТИСТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

Незважаючи на те що вплив грошової маси на інвестиції та ВВП активно досліджується, не всі аспекти цього процесу вивчені достатньою мірою. Це, зокрема, пов'язано з «ною нормальністю», яка склалася останнім часом. Її особливості не дозволяють вико-

ристовувати класичні концепції та моделі для формування ефективної монетарної політики, тим більше у специфічних умовах емерджентної економіки, до якої належить Україна. Метою статті є визначення взаємозв'язку грошових агрегатів, інвестицій та ВВП у нових умовах шляхом аналізу часових рядів економічних даних.

Інформаційною базою дослідження є статистика Світового банку за країнами світу з показниками «широких» грошей (M3) і валових інвестицій. Статистичний аналіз дозволив встановити, що понад 71% розглянутих країн мають суттєву кореляцію між M3 та валовими інвестиціями. Визначено, наскільки сила кореляції залежить від рівня соціально-економічного розвитку. Для цього на основі методу «найближчих сусідів» здійснено класифікацію країн у двовимірному просторі: за параметрами доходу на душу населення і щільності зв'язку M2 та інвестицій. Аналіз свідчить, що 79% з усіх розглянутих країн опинилися в класі з доведеною високою кореляцією, причому незалежно від рівня їхнього багатства та розвитку. У цьому ж просторі ознак виконано кластерний аналіз країн із використанням методу «зрушення середнього», який дозволив із точністю 91% розподілити країни на п'ять кластерів із різними соціально-економічними умовами, а також виокремити групу країн, особливо чутливих до зниження рівня монетизації, аж до негативних наслідків для економіки.

Доведено, що незалежно від рівня розвитку економіки зростання «широкої» грошової маси є чинником, який істотно впливає на зростання ВВП. Незважаючи на те що даний чинник розглядається як необхідний, він не є достатнім для зростання економіки, особливо в період Четвертої промислової революції, коли держава має відігравати більш активну та складну роль у прискоренні національного техніко-технологічного розвитку.

Ключові слова: грошова маса, інвестиції, ВВП, монетизація, кореляція, кластерний аналіз.

JEL: G18, G28, C12, C22

Денис Владимирович Липницький,

канд. экон. наук, архитектор приложений, технический тренер

i-Klass, учебный центр

ул. Шота Руставели, 39/41, г. Киев, 01033, Украина

E-mail: d.lipnitsky@i-klass.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4616-7936>;

Полина Денисовна Липницкая

учебный онлайн центр «Up2Date»

E-mail: kumpersina@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1722-1697>

ВЛИЯНИЕ ДЕНЕЖНОЙ МАССЫ НА ИНВЕСТИЦИИ И ВВП: СТАТИСТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ

Несмотря на то что влияние денежной массы на инвестиции и ВВП активно исследуется, не все его аспекты достаточно изучены. В частности, сложившаяся в последние годы «новая нормальность» не позволяет использовать классические концепции и модели для формирования эффективной монетарной политики, тем более в специфических условиях эмерджентной экономики, к которой относится Украина. Целью статьи является определение взаимосвязи денежных агрегатов, инвестиций и ВВП в новых условиях посредством анализа временных рядов экономических данных.

Информационной базой исследования является статистика Мирового банка по странам мира с показателями «широких» денег (M3) и валовых инвестиций. Статистический анализ позволил установить, что более 71% рассматриваемых стран показали существен-

ную корреляцию между МЗ и валовыми инвестициями. Определено, насколько сила корреляции зависит от уровня социально-экономического развития страны. Для этого на основе метода «ближайших соседей» проведена классификация стран в двухмерном пространстве: по параметрам дохода на душу населения и тесноты связи М2 и инвестиций. Анализ показал, что 79% из всех анализируемых стран оказались в классе с доказуемой высокой корреляцией, причем независимо от уровня их богатства и развития. В том же пространстве признаков выполнен кластерный анализ стран с использованием метода «сдвига среднего». Этот метод позволил с точностью 91% разделить страны на пять кластеров с различными социально-экономическими условиями, а также выделить отдельную группу стран, особенно чувствительных к снижению уровня монетизации, вплоть до самых негативных последствий для экономики.

Доказано, что независимо от уровня развития экономики рост «широкой» денежной массы является фактором, существенно влияющим на рост ВВП. Несмотря на то что этот фактор рассматривается как необходимый, он, тем не менее, не является достаточным для роста экономики, особенно в период Четвертой промышленной революции, когда государство должно играть более активную и сложную роль в ускорении национального технико-технологического развития.

Ключевые слова: денежная масса, инвестиции, ВВП, монетизация, корреляция, кластерный анализ.

JEL: G18, G28, C12, C22

Формат цитирования:

Lypnytskyi D. V., Lypnytska P. D. (2022). Money supply impact on investment and GDP: statistical analysis. *Економіка промисловості*. № 1 (97). С. 89-102. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.15407/econindustry2022.01.089>

Lypnytskyi, D. V., & Lypnytska, P. D. (2022). Money supply impact on investment and GDP: statistical analysis. *Econ. promisl.*, 1 (97), pp. 89-102. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.15407/econindustry2022.01.089>

Надійшла до редакції 21.01.2022 р.