

Effect of Oil Price Shocks on Macroeconomic Stability in Indonesia

Olookan Busari M.

Department of Economics, University of Lagos, Nigeria.

Date of Submission: 13-04-2025

Date of Acceptance: 26-04-2025

ABSTRACT

This study adumbrate the nexus between macroeconomic stability in the ambit of price level or inflation and oil price shocks using yearly data from the Indonesia economy spanning 1960 to 2023. The study leverage on combination of some analyses including FMOL, DOLS, CCR and finds that oil price shocks exert influence on indecision economy from 1970 to 1996 but no significant influence between 1997 and 2022.Exchange rate is major factor to reckoned with for the periods between 1997 and 2022 while the policy of asymmetric effect of oil price shock in the short run paved way for diversification of the economy. The initial response of real GDP, exchange rate, inflation, trade openness to a shock in oil price is positive while interest rate respond negatively.

Keywords: Oil price, Inflation, Real GDP, Interest rate, Trade openness, macroeconomic stability, Indonesia

I. Introduction

Government is relevant in any society for provision and preservation of enabling economic environment where the economic activities strive. One prominent yardstick of measuring economic stability in any country is general price level captured by inflation. Inflation has always been a prominent concern of policy makers and its effects on the government and the governed are taken as paramount concern of all and sundry. As a yardstick of measuring economic stability over time, a persistent upward rise in general price level will definitely exert an asymmetric effects on government policy and people way of life over time to shape their expectation of their value of money.

Meanwhile, oil price shocks could be positive in the ambit of surge or hike in oil price. It could be negative in the purview of plunge, diving or decrease in oil price. The associated short run effects and the long run impacts of the unexpected price divergences varies significantly and astronomically between countries that depend extensively on oil or petroleum earnings for their foreign reserve or foreign earning and exchange conservation. The ends results are often asymmetrical depending on the economy's peculiarities and profile most especially the economy synergy of possibility coupled with her export portfolio combination.

Besides, the expressed dichotomy between the short run effects and the long run impacts are also function of policy responses packages put in place to address the divergences in prices and swiftness in response mechanism without prejudice to lag polarization and dimension. Some economies may be at mercy of exogenous oil price gyration induced only from outside the system while other economies count the price shocks as blessing to replenish the economic profile generally. Those economies that use petroleum export as complement to other vibrant export commodities always grab the golden benefit of changes in prices of oil as time of adjustment mechanism is very swift, prompt if not even instantaneous. The positive spill over effects are often tailored to economic diversification to shift the frontier of the economic fortune, economic growth and development consistently.

Meanwhile, study of Jubril and Halace (2019) has revealed that the sudden hike in oil process are often associated with real output increase or growth. Money supply increase is not unconnected with oil price surge with minimal or infinitesimal upward trend in the real effective exchange rate but downward trend in inflation rates and short run interest rates.

Going forward, the Indonesian economy kicked started her passion for economic growth and development in 1960 on rough terrain with feeble economic indicators profile. Inflation rate was astronomical inform of treble digit. In 1966, inflation profile dovetailed to 1136% macrotrend (2024). Bank Indonesia BI (2013).

Again, the Indonesian economy had hydra headed economic challenges to combat with. The population profile of the country in 1966 was 103,561,105 at annual growth rate in population put at 2.38% at the same year. Macrotrends (2024). Besides, one is only tempted to go on voyage of discovery to scrutinise what could be the data of life



expectancy in Indonesia economy in 1960 compared to her counterpart country in that year and what is the asymmetrical position in 2024. The data depicted life expectancy of Indonesia and Nigerian economies in 1960 to be 46.32 years at growth rate of 1.36% and 36.73 years at growth rate of 1.280% respectively. These data however become 72.50 years with growth rate of 0.240% and 56.05 years with growth rate of 0.550% respective in 2024 Macrotrend (2024).

The study on effects of oil price shocks on macroeconomic stability in the ambit of inflation can be utilized in economic analysis or use as abstraction of economic model to shift new frontier of knowledge in order to appreciate the nexus of oil price shocks on macroeconomic stability in general. Above all, the remainder of the paper is fragmented where the second section anchors the literature review on the nexus of oil price shocks and macroeconomic stability with special concentration on inflation. In sequence, the third section presents the data and methodology employed in the research. Section four is devoted to the empirical outcome and finding while the last section or the fifth section presents conclusion, suggestion as well as policy implication in general.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical literature review are replica with myriads theories on linkage of oil price shocks and macroeconomic stability. The challenges mooted in the theoretical underpinning the nexus of oil price shocks and macroeconomic stability hurled and sparked a lot of empirical studies which illuminated the marginal area of gaps.

Yusuff and Abdul-Latif (2013) employed an ARDL Bound test to investigate the effects of world oil prices changes on Economic growth and Energy Demand in Malaysia for the period between 1975 and 2000. The study found that there was a long run relationship between economic growth, energy demand and employment in the long run.

Degiamakis et al (2018) investigate whether oil prices and stock markets move in opposite direction or in tandem. The study employed analytical survey and reviewed plethora studies to arrive at their findings. The study found three types of asymmetric specification which are positive and negative oil price returns, scaled oil price increases and decreases, and the third is net oil price increase.

Adeleke et al (2019) carried out their study on crude oil price shocks and macroeconomic performance in African's oil-producing countries. The study employed a panel structural vector autoregression model and found that structural inflation always accompany sharp plunge in oil prices more than monetary inflation as both investment and outputs dwindled astronomically. The study concluded among other that Dutch disease is not unconnected with Africa's oil producing countries, and that inflationary behaviour is not symmetric to asymmetric oil price shocks.

Baek and Choi (2020) carried out their study in the ambit of fluctuations in crude oil prices. The thrusts of their paper are on the symmetric and asymmetric effects on crude oil price fluctuations in relation to Indonesia. They employed non-linear autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) mechanism with objective of testing the effects of crude oil process fluctuations. The findings of the study states that the oil price shocks have asymmetrical effects on the real exchange of the Indonesian economy in the long run. The study then concluded that there is asymmetrical effects of oil price shocks in the long run while symmetrical effect prevails in the short run.

Moreso, Darmawan et al (2020) premised their empirical study on the effect of crude oil price shocks in Indonesia stock market performance. The authors utilized vector error correction model (VECM) to study the nexus between Brent crude oil price and the seven stock market indices. They found that crude oil price shocks affect the Indonesia stock market performance directly via co-integration mechanism.

Wang et al (2020) employed a time-varying parameter vector autoregressive popularly tagged as VAR model to study the impacts of oil price shocks on China's economy. They found the downward trend in the impacts of oil price shocks on China's economy since 1997. They also discovered that the response of real output to be higher and long lasting compared to that of inflation.

Gong et al (2021) employed structural vector autoregressive model (SVAR) with Bayesian estimation method to examine the dynamic effects of international oil price shocks on macroeconomics fluctuation. They found that oil price shocks constraints on economic output more than oil supply and aggregate demand, and recommended that government subsidies alleviated the impacts on energy intensive industries compared to others

Chen (2022) employed Structural Vector Autoregressive (SVAR) model to study the inflationary effects of oil prices and justified same based on the study of (Van Huellen (2020)), (Baumeisto and Hamilton 2019), (Ederington et al 2020), (Herera and Rangaraju 2020), (Zhou 2019).The paper identified and isolated three categories of shocks, the aggregate demand shock, the oil supply shock, and the oil market specific demand shock. The study found that the largest oil



price pass through is as a result of oil supply shock, and recommended that there is needs to disentangle demand and supply shocks in the crude oil market.

Kim and Vera (2022) examined the effect of oil price fluctuation on the US economy. The authors employed SVAR procedure and found oil supply shocks to have a negative effects on the USA real GDP. The degrees of responses are taken to be asymmetrical, aggregate demand shocks as well as oil market specific shocks seemed to present positive effect on price.

Hwang and Kim (2023) investigate the effect of the state dependent on crude oil price shocks on the US aggregate economy. The authors employed a smooth transition Vector Auto Regression model and Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test to study the effects of normalized supply and demand shocks in the global oil market. The study found that structural shocks in the oil markets conditional on recessions have higher and greater persistent in the ambit of contractionary impact on macroeconomics variables. Ahmed et al (2023) employed combination of three analyses of VAR model, time-varying, VAR analyses, and time varying model with robustness to investigate the relationship between inflation, oil prices and economic activity in the UK. They found Brent crude oil shocks to be the fastest in responding to hike in inflation compared to other variables. The authors concluded that impact of inflation shocks is prominent in the first quarter but wanes in the long run.

III. Data and Methodology of the Study

This section anchored methodology, specification of model, sources of data collection, and techniques evolved in the study.

3.1 Specification of Model

The model leveraged on group equation specified as follows:

Baseline Model

Logarithms of Real Gross domestic product is represented by (InRGDP), logarithms of price of oil (InPOIL), Inflation rate (INFR), interest rate (INTR), logarithms of exchange rate (EXR) and logarithms of trade openness (InTOP).

Sources of Data Collection

The study basically premised on secondary data and data were collected from World Bank publications to guarantee the authenticity of data. Data on oil price were collected from World Bank publication, OPEC publication of various years. Data on real GDP were gathered from World Bank publication of various years. Data on exchange rate, interest, inflation, trade openness were also gathered from World Bank publications of various years confirmed by the Bank of Indonesia, Bank Indonesia (BI) of various years to guarantee the accuracy and authenticity of the data utilized in the study.

3.2 Methodology of the Study

This study leveraged on Sequel to the determination of the necessary unit root tests adumbrated above the Fully Modified Least Squares (FMOLS), Dynamic Least Squares (DOLS) and Canonical co-integrating Regression (CCR) were employed and the study is fragmented or broken down into two compartments of period spanning from 1970-1996 and 1997 – 2022 for simplification of reference and comparison in simplicity. The study also use the VAR model and computed the impulse response function. Test for Stationarity of the data were conducted using combination of methods such as Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF), Philip Person (P-P), KPSS tests for the presence of unit root tests.

IV. PRESENTATION OF EMPIRICAL RESULTS



This aspect of the study anchored the presentation of empirical result of the study. The aspect starts from the analysis of time series properties of the variables employed for the analysis and estimation. This of course developed out of necessity to guarantee and ascertain the specification and estimation authenticity and accuracy.

Analysis of Unit Root Test

The analysis also depicted that only inflation and the interest rate are 1 (0) or stationary at the level. The other variable are not stationery at the

level which prompted us to carry out the unit root test and determine whether there is possibility of long run relationship between the variable or whether the variable are co-integrated. Judging from the background of stationarity of only two variables out of six variables at level where only inflation and interest rate are 1 (0) and others four variable are not 1(0), the conduct of unit root test for all variables of real GDP, price of oil, exchange rate, inflation rate, interest rate and trade openness become a child of necessity. The study therefore employed ADF. P-P, KPSS as presented in the table one.

| | Table 1 | | Unit Root Test | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|----------|-------|
| | | Co- | P-P | Co- | KPSS | Co- |
| | ADF | order | | n order | | order |
| | | L | EVEL | norder | | order |
| Intercept | | 5% = -2.918778 | | | | |
| LOG(RGDP) | 0.478716 | | -0.001373 | | 0.783374 | |
| LOG(Exchange Rate) | -2.162863 | | -1.912812 | | 0.729442 | |
| Inflation | -3.562738 | I(0) | -3.391382 | I(0) | 0.187322 | I(0) |
| Interest Rate | -5.653687 | I(0) | -5.663165 | I(0) | 0.763807 | I(0) |
| Oil Price | -1.580251 | | -1.580251 | | 0.146642 | |
| Openness | -2.422270 | | -2.649527 | | 0.148509 | |
| Intercept and Trend | 5% = -3.498692 | | | | | |
| LOG(RGDP) | -1.853683 | | -1.407495 | | 0.209397 | |
| LOG(Exchange Rate) | -3.082764 | | -3.083654 | | 0.122631 | |
| Inflation | -4.173568 | I(0) | -3.398368 | | 0.132527 | I(0) |
| Interest Rate | -6.426837 | I(0) | -6.400144 | I(0) | 0.062655 | |
| Oil Price | -1.592357 | | -1.747948 | | 0.132109 | |
| Openness | -2.328897 | | -2.573614 | | 0.082966 | |
| FIRST DIFFERENCE | | | | | | |
| Intercept | 5% = -2.922449 | | | | | |
| LOG(RGDP) | -3.340689 | I(1) | -5.583111 | I(1) | 0.147860 | I(1) |
| LOG(Exchange Rate) | -5.469982 | I(1) | -9.359540 | I(1) | 0.122631 | I(1) |
| Inflation | -7.415835 | I(1) | -15.76256 | I(1) | 0.500000 | I(1) |
| Interest Rate | -4.863497 | I(1) | -39.66743 | I(1) | 0.380654 | I(1) |
| Oil Price | -5.919125 | I(1) | -5.852161 | I(1) | 0.094254 | I(1) |
| Openness | -7.639817 | I(1) | -7.635333 | I(1) | 0.082966 | I(1) |
| Intercept and Trend | 5% = -3.504330 | | | | | |
| LOG(RGDP) | -3.460340 | I(1) | -5.642911 | I(1) | 0.095302 | I(1) |

| Impact Factor value 7.52 |



| LOG(Exchange | -5.406542 | I(1) | -9.220819 | I(1) | 0.138812 | I(1) |
|---------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|----------|------|
| Rate) | | | | | | |
| Inflation | -7.351885 | I(1) | -15.54637 | I(1) | 0.500000 | I(1) |
| Interest Rate | -4.772711 | I(1) | -39.07946 | I(1) | 0.282734 | I(1) |
| Oil Price | -5.112333 | I(1) | -5.788282 | I(1) | 0.086657 | I(1) |
| Openness | -7.585385 | I(1) | -7.581157 | I(1) | 0.053700 | I(1) |

At 5% the criteria is -2.9 22 449 which is yardstick of determination of stationarity at 5%.

The test revealed that ADF, P, P and KPSS results support the unit root hypotheses and that the null hypotheses are accepted for all the series. All the variable are integrated of order 1(1). This confirmed that the variables are stationary at first difference popularly described as contained above.

Analysis of Result and Comparison between the Periods

Based on the results obtained from the three techniques of Fully Modified Least Squares (FMOLS) Dynamic Least Squares (DOLS), Canonical Co-integrating Regression (CCR) and using log RGDP as Dependent variable from period 1970 – 1996 the follows are observed. Exchange rate is significant explanatory variable of real GDP judging by the result of FMOLS and CCR. Exchange rate is quoted as 0.5357 and 0.5422 which are significant at 1% under FMOLS and CCR based on the period of 1970 to 1996. By concise interpretation, 1 unit change in real GDP will lead to 0.5357 and 0.5422 variation in GDP or 53% and 54%

respectively influence on the real GDP. The coefficient is also positive suggesting a direct relationship between exchange rate and real GDP. Inflation rate is not significant based on the result of the three methods. At the level of interest rate, it is significant at 10% under FMOLS and negative. It is also significant under DOLS and is quoted as -0.0484. It is significant at 5%. This suggests indirect relationship between real GDP and interest rate. Oil price shock is not significant throughout the three techniques. However, trade openness is significant at 5% under FMOLS and at 10% under CCR for the case of Indonesia between 1970 and 1996. From Table 3, the result under 1997 – 2022 is presented.* The exchange rate is significant under the three techniques and quoted as 0.5731 significant at 1% under FMOLS, 0.8554. It is significant at 5% under DOLS and 0.2999. It is significant at 1% under CCR for Indonesia between 1997 and 2022. Interest rate is not significant throughout from 1997 – 2022 based on the results from the three techniques. Also, inflation is significant under FMOLS at 10%. It is significant at 1%. under DOLS, CCR quoted as 0.0854. 0.0064, and 0.00862 respectively.

| Period: 1970 - 1996 | Dependent Variable: LOG (RGDP) | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | Fully Modified Least Squares (FMOLS) | Dynamic Least Squares (DOLS) | Canonical Cointegrating Regression (CCR) | | |
| | Indonesia | Indonesia | Indonesia | | |
| Variable | Coefficient | Coefficient | Coefficient | | |
| LOG Exchange Rate | 0.5357*** | 0.2978 | 0.5422**** | | |
| Inflation Rate | -0.0046 | -0.0116 | -0.0045 | | |
| Interest Rate | -0.0126* | -0.0484** | -0.0169 | | |
| LOG Oil Price | 0.0564 | 0.1019 | 0.0814 | | |
| LOG Openness | 0.6593** | 0.6052 | 0.5776* | | |
| С | 19.7851*** | 22.109*** | 20.029*** | | |
| R-squared | 0.9592 | 0.9980 | 0.9573 | | |

Table 2



| Adjusted R- | 0.9490 | 0.9848 | 0.9466 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| squared | | | |

Note * = 10 %, ** = 5%, and ** * = 1 % significant kevel.

| Period: 1970 – 2022 | Dependent Variable: LOG (RGDP) | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | Fully Modified Least Squares (FMOLS) | Dynamic Least Squares (DOLS) | Canonical Cointegrating Regression (CCR) | |
| | Indonesia | Indonesia | Indonesia | |
| Variable | Coefficient | Coefficient | Coefficient | |
| LOG Exchange Rate | 0.5370*** | 0.4200*** | 0.5311*** | |
| Inflation Rate | -0.0101* | -0.028*** | -0.0113 | |
| Interest Rate | -0.0036 | -0.0160 | -0.0043 | |
| LOG Oil Price | 0.0854 | -0.0064 | 0.0862 | |
| LOG Openness | -0.2638 | -0.803*** | -0.2606 | |
| С | 23.092*** | 26.734*** | 23.140*** | |
| | 0.9410 | 0.9773 | 0.9401 | |
| Adjusted R- squared | 0.9346 | 0.9616 | 0.9339 | |

Table 3

Note * = 10 %, ** = 5%, and ** * = 1% significant kevel.

However, oil price is not significant at all under FMOLS, DOLS. The co-efficient is positive and suggest that 1% variation in the dependent variable will lead to amount of co-efficient changes based on the figures of independent variables from 1997 – 2022 under the three techniques. Trade openness is significant under the three techniques at 1% and it is quoted as-0.803. Above all, the R^2 of 0.9410, 0.9773 and 0.9401 also confirm goodness of fit and quasi total caption of the independent variables on dependent variable.

A calm examination of the results in both cases indicates that the effects of oil price shocks on macroeconomic variable has asymmetric effects in Indonesia under the two periods the second period of 1997 to 2022 indicates that oil price as variable is not significant at all under the three techniques adopted. In specific term, oil price accounted for about 0.0854 under FMOLS, - 0.0064 under DOLS and 0.0862 under CCR which is approximately 8% positive, - 0.01% and 0.9% respectively for the variations in dependent variable or real GDP during the period of 1997 – 2022 using FMOLS, DOLS and CCR

respectively. These results can be juxtaposed with that of similar report during the years spanning the periods of 1970 - 1996. The inevitable conclusion is that oil price shocks was not an issue or not significant or major variable or factor to be reckoned with in Indonesia as a prime harbinger of variation in real GDP and the policy makers need to formulate robust policy to garner best opportunity from the proceeds of other resources devoid of oil price shocks whether positive or negative most especially in the ambit of diversification of the wind fall from the proceeds.

V. Conclusion

This study has established firmly that the oil price shocks exert major impact on the economy of Indonesia during the period 1970 to 1996 and no significant influence during the period 1997 to 2022. The effects are asymmetric over 1970 to 1996 but symmetrical between 1997 and 2022. The policy makers have to pay serious attention and formulate vibrant policy that will make the economy achieve utilization of wind fall proceeds from oil price shocks



per excellent and to benefit from the synergy of possibility. The policy maker in Indonesia will also need to augment the other resources apart from oil and oil proceeds which is no longer an issue between 1997 and 2022. Meanwhile, the area of recommendation could be study in bi countries comparison over the same gestation of time to appreciate the position of other countries with similar experience and how those countries garnered the opportunity from oil price shocks and to learn some lesson from such achievements where applicable.

INDONESIA Shock in Global Oil Price

Response to Cholesky One S.D. (d.f. adjusted) Innovations ± 2 S.E.



Response of INFLATION to DLOG(OIL_PRICE)



Response of DLOG(OIL_PRICE) to DLOG(OIL_PRICE)





Response of INTEREST_RATE to DLOG(OIL_PRICE)



Response of DLOG(OPENNESS) to DLOG(OIL_PRICE)





References

- Adeleke et a (2019). Crude oil price shocks and macroeconomic performance in Africa's oil producing countries. Cogent Economics & Finance in Africa's oil producing countries. Cogent economics & Finance ISSN (print) 2332 – 2039 (online) Journal home page <u>https://www.andonline.com/loi/oaef20</u>
- [2]. Ahmed et al (2023). Inflation, oil prices and economic activity in recent crises evidence from the UK. *Energy Economics*. Volume 126, October 2023, 106918.
- [3]. Ambrose A. (2009). Nigerian Proven Oil Reserve masterweb. <u>http://www.bp.com/liveassets/bpinternet/glob</u> <u>albp/globalbp.uk</u>ka Swadaya iisd international Institute for Sustainable Development for the Global subsidies initiatives (GSV of the IISD Geneva, Switzerland
- [4]. Antonio Garzo Luis A. Hierro (2021). Asymmetries in the transmission of oil price shocks to inflation in the eurozone economic modelling, Volume 105 pg 2021 105665
- [5]. Apere O.T. & Maxwell LA (2013) The Effects of Oil Price Shock on Monetary Policy. Policy in Nigeria International Review of Social Sciences www.irssh.com ISSN 2248-9010 (online), ISSN 2250-0715 (print)
- [6]. Babatunde, S. O. (2019). Oil price shocks fuel subsidies and macroeconomic (in)stability in Nigeria. *CBN Journal of Applied Statistics*. Vol 10 No 2 (December 2019).
- [7]. Baek, J. Choi, J. (2020). "Do fluctuation in crude oil price have symmetric or asymmetric effects on the real exchange range? Empirical evidence from Indonesia 1 AEE 2020
- [8]. Balke, N. S., Brown, S.P.A & Yice, M. K. (2002). Oil price shocks and the US Economy where does the asymmetry originate". *The Energy Journal*. Vol 23 No 3. International Association of Energy Economists.
- [9]. Bank Indonesia (2013), maintaining stability, Advancing Structural Reform for Sustainable Economic Growth. Economic Report on Indonesia
- [10]. Barnes, A. (2022). oil price outlook 2023: Here's what the analysis think.
- [11]. Bello, M. & Sa'ad, S. (2021). Impact of oil price shocks on selected macroeconomic variable in Nigeria from (1970-2016). *Global Journal of Applied Management of Social Sciences (GOJAMISS)*. Vol 21. January 2021. p 280-291 (ISSN, 2276-9013)

- [12]. Bhattacharyyasc (2011) Energy Economics Concepts, Issues, Markets and Governance. Springer.
- [13]. BP Report (2010), The World Proven Oil Reserve and the years nigerianmasterweb.com
- [14]. Braithuaite D, Soelaiman S. Wiroyudo GK, Trimurdadi H, Soeleman S, Utomo S.P and Ralchmanto P.A (2010) Fossil fuels - Al what cost? Government Support for Upstream Oil and Gas Activities in Indonesia Asia, PT Cakramusti
- [15]. CBN (2013), Annual report/31st Dec.
- [16]. CBN Bullion (2013), Publication of Central Bank of Nigeria 84
- [17]. Chen, S. S. (2022). "Revisiting the inflationary effects of oil prices". *The Energy Journal*, 30(4) copyright (c) 2022 by the IAEE. International Association of Energy Economists.
- [18]. Darmavan. I. Siregar H, Jakim D B, Mamurving A. H. (2020)
- [19]. Degiamakis, S. Filis, G. and Arora V. (2018). Oil price and stock market. A review of the theory and empirical evidence. *The energy journal*, Vol 39 No 5 https/doi.ng 1054470195657439.3.
- [20]. Ederington et al (2020) quoted in Chen, S. S. (2022). "Revisiting the inflationary effects of oil prices". *The Energy Journal*, 30(4) copyright (c) 2022 by the IAEE. International Association of Energy Economists.
- [21]. Friedman, B. M (1977b). The inefficiencies of short-run monetary targets for monetary policy" Brookings paper on economic activity; No 2 page 293 – 335.
- [22]. Gilbert, R. J. & Mork, K. A. (1986). Efficient pricing during oil supply disruption. *The Energy Journal*. Vol 7 No 2. International Association of Energy Economists.
- [23]. Gong, et al (2021). The dynamic effects of international oil price shocks on economic fluctuation resources policy Vol. 74 December 2021, 102304
- [24]. Grand Wald, M. (2008). "Large and shocks and the US. Economy in frequent incident with large effects. *The Energy Journal*. Vol 29 No 1. International Association of Energy Economists (IAEE).
- [25]. Hwang , I & Kim, J. (2023). Oil price shocks and macroeconomics dynamics, How important is the role of nonlinearity. Springer link *Empirical Economics*. Published 28 August 2023
- [26]. Ibrahim et al (2014). Oil price shocks and Nigerian Economic Growth. *Haropean*



Scientific Journal. July 2014 edition Vol. 10 No 19 ISSN 1857, 1857-1881 (print0 e ISSN 1857-7431

- [27]. Irving Fisher (1996). Irving Fisher and Quantity Theory of Money www.cambridge.org.
- [28]. Jubril, U. & Holac U, (2019). International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administration Sciences (IJCEAS) ISSN 1925-4423 Volume 9 Issue 1 Year 2019 pp 94 - 118 DOI 105281 zeriodo 3262261
- [29]. Kim and Vera (2022). The effect of oil price fluctuation on the economy: What can we learn from alternative model. *Journal of Applied Economics*. Volume 25,2022 Issue 1.
- [30]. Leek, NIS & Ratti, R. A. (1995), "Oil shocks and the macroeconomy. The role of price vriability". *The Energy Journal*. Vol 16 No 4. International Association of Energy Economists.
- [31]. Lucas Jr. R. E. (1976) "Economic policy evaluation: A critique in Brunner K and Meltzer, A. A. (eds). The Philips curve and labour markets. *Journal of monetary economics supplement*, Vol. 1 April, 19-46
- [32]. Lucas, Jr. R. E. (1972) "Expectations and the neutrality of money" *Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 4 April 103 – 124
- [33]. Macro Trends (2024). Indonesia Population 1960 – 2024.
 - http://www.macrotrends.net
- [34]. Macro Trends (2024). Indonesia Inflation Rate 1960 – 2024. http://www.macrotrends.net
- [35]. Macro Trends (2024). Indonesia life expectancy 1960 – 2024. http://www.macrotrends.net
- [36]. Macro Trends (2024). Indonesia GDP per capital 1960 – 2024. <u>http://www.macrotrends.net</u>
- [37]. Macro Trends (2024). Indonesia export 1960 - 2024. http://www.macrotrends.net
- [38]. Macro Trends (2024). Indonesia import 1960 – 2024.
 - http://www.macrotrends.net
- [39]. Muth, J. P. (1961). Rational Expectation and the theory of price movements econmetrical. *Journal of Economic Society*. (1961) pp. 305 – 335.
- [40]. Morana, C. (2013). The oil price macro economy relationship since the mid 1980. A global perspective. *The energy journal*. Vol 34 No 3 International Association of Energy Economists.

- [41]. Ogbuigwe (2018). Nigeria hosts four oil refineries which together have combined refining capability of estimated 45,000 barrel per day. www.researchgate.net
- [42]. Sims, C. A. (1992). "Interpreting the macroeconomic time series facts; The effects of monetary policy" European Economic Review 36(5), 975 – 1000
- [43]. Van Huellen (2020) quoted in Chen, S. S. (2022). "Revisiting the inflationary effects of oil prices". *The Energy Journal*, 30(4) copyright (c) 2022 by the IAEE. International Association of Energy Economists.
- [44]. Wang, S. Zhang, X and Zhaof, L. (2020).
 "Why the effects of oil price shocks on China's Economy are changing. *The energy journal*. Vol 41 No 6 1 AEE https doi.ng 10.55419 5657441 6 swam
- [45]. Youshua-Li & Junjie Guo (2022). The asymmetric impacts of oil price and shocks on inflation on BRICS: A multiple threshold non linear ARDL Model. *All Journal Applied Economics*, Volume 54, 2022 Issue 12.
- [46]. Zhou (2019), quoted in Chen, S. S. (2022).
 "Revisiting the inflationary effects of oil prices". *The Energy Journal*, 30(4) copyright (c) 2022 by the IAEE. International Association of Energy E*conomists.

| Impact Factor value 7.52 |