Inflation and Growth: New Evidence From a Dynamic Panel Threshold Analysis*

Stephanie Kremer
Free University Berlin

Alexander Bick
Goethe-University Frankfurt

Dieter Nautz
Free University Berlin

February 23, 2011

Abstract

We introduce a dynamic panel threshold model to estimate inflation thresholds for long-term economic growth. Advancing on Hansen (1999) and Caner and Hansen(2004), our model allows the estimation of threshold effects with panel data even in case of endogenous regressors. The empirical analysis is based on a large panel-data set including 124 countries. For industrialized countries, our results confirm the inflation targets of about 2% set by many central banks. For non-industrialized countries, we estimate that inflation rates exceeding 17% are associated with lower economic growth. Below this threshold, however, the correlation remains insignificant.

Keywords: Inflation Thresholds, Inflation and Growth, Dynamic Panel Threshold Model

JEL classification: E31, C23, O40

*This research was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the CRC 649 "Economic Risk". We thank Jörg Breitung and Paula Hernandez-Verme for helpful comments and suggestions. E-mail: stephanie.kremer@fu-berlin.de, bick@wiwi.uni-frankfurt.de, dieter.nautz@fu-berlin.de. Corresponding author: Dieter Nautz, Free University Berlin, Department of Economics, Boltzmannstr. 20, D-14195 Berlin.

1 Introduction

Most economists would agree that inflation has distortional effects on long-term economic growth if it gets "too high". Yet how high is too high? In the aftermath of the recent financial crisis, the long-time consensus on inflation targets for industrialized countries centering around 2% has been put up for discussion. Following e.g. Blanchard, DellAriccia and Mauro (2010), the effects of inflation on growth are difficult to discern, so long as inflation remains in the single digits. As a consequence, they suggest that an inflation target of 4% might be more appropriate because it leaves more room for expansionary monetary policy in case of adverse shocks. For developing countries, the appropriate level of the inflation target is also unclear. Bruno and Easterly (1998), for example, showed in a cross-sectional setting that inflation has only a detrimental impact on long-term economic growth if inflation exceeds a critical level of 40% — a rather large value which may be of only of limited relevance for monetary policy of many countries.[1]

The theoretical literature offers various channels through which inflation may distort or even foster economic growth, see Temple (2000). If these different channels overlap or offset each other, or unfold an economic meaningful impact only for certain ranges of inflation, the relationship between inflation and economic growth might be characterized by inflation thresholds, see Vaona (2010).[2] A natural starting point for the empirical analysis of inflation thresholds is the panel threshold model introduced by Hansen (1999) which is designed to estimate threshold values instead of imposing them. Yet, the application of Hansen's threshold model to the empirical analysis of the inflation-growth nexus is not without problems. The most important limitation of Hansen's

[1] For example, the Southern African Development Community (SADC) convergence criteria requires a low single digit inflation rate, see Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan available at `http://www.sadc.int/attachment/download/file/74`. Recent empirical work by Goncalves and Salles (2008) and Lin and Ye (2009) suggests that inflation targeting in developing countries can lead to significant improvements in terms of inflation and output volatility.

[2] Similar non-linear effects of inflation have been documented by Bick and Nautz (2008) for relative price variability in the US and by Khan, Senhadji and Smith (2006) for financial depth in a large cross-country panel data set.

model is that all regressors are required to be exogenous. In growth regressions with panel data, the exogeneity assumption is particular severe, because initial income as a crucial variable is endogenous by construction. Caselli, Esquivel and Lefort (1996) already demonstrated for linear panel models of economic growth that the endogeneity bias can be substantial. So far, dynamic versions of Hansen's panel threshold model have not been available. Therefore, with a view to the central role of initial income for the convergence debate of the economic growth literature, most empirical studies on growth-related thresholds applying the Hansen methodology decided to ignore the potential endogeneity bias, see Khan and Senhadji (2001), Cuaresma and Silgoner (2004), Foster (2006) and Bick (2010). In contrast, Drukker, Gomis-Porqueras and Hernandez-Verme (2005) excluded initial income from their growth regressions to avoid the endogeneity problem. Both ways to deal with the endogeneity of initial income can lead to biased estimates of the inflation thresholds and to misleading conclusions about the impact of inflation on growth in the corresponding inflation regimes.[3]

This paper introduces a dynamic version of Hansen's panel threshold model to shed more light on the inflation-growth nexus. By applying the forward orthogonal deviations transformation suggested by Arellano and Bover (1995), we combine the instrumental variable estimation of the cross-sectional threshold model introduced by Caner and Hansen (2004) with the panel threshold model of Hansen (1999). In the dynamic model, the endogeneity of important control variables is no longer an issue. This permits us to estimate the critical level of inflation for economic growth for industrialized and non-industrialized countries albeit the endogeneity problem of initial income.

Our empirical results strongly confirm earlier evidence in favor of inflation thresholds in the inflation-growth nexus. In accordance with Khan and Senhadji (2001), we find notable differences between the results obtained for industrialized and non-industrialized countries. For industrialized countries, the estimated inflation threshold is about 2.5%

[3]Note that alternative approaches to estimate a non-linear relationship between inflation and growth face the same problem: they either exclude initial income (Omay and Kan, 2010) or do not control for its endogeneity (Burdekin, Denzau, Keil, Sitthiyot and Willet, 2004; Hineline, 2007; Vaona and Schiavo, 2007).

which provides strong support for the inflation targets of many central banks. In particular, inflation rates below/above 2.5% are associated with higher/lower long-term economic growth in industrialized countries. For developing countries, the estimated inflation threshold is 17.2%. Inflation rates exceeding this critical value, i.e. if it gets "too high", come along with significantly lower economic growth with a magnitude similar to industrialized countries. In contrast, there is no significant association between inflation and long-term economic growth in developing countries when inflation is below 17.2%.

Given the lack of a standard theory on the relationship between inflation and long-term economic growth, our empirical results on the inflation-growth nexus have to be interpreted with caution. Strictly speaking, our estimates may only reflect correlations and do not necessarily imply causality from inflation to growth. Yet, reduced form estimates may still serve as a benchmark and a first guideline for the discussion on the optimal level of inflation targets.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the econometrics of the dynamic panel threshold model. Section 3 introduces the data and the control variables employed in our empirical application. In Section 4 the dynamic panel threshold model is applied to the inflation-growth nexus in industrialized and non-industrialized countries. Section 5 concludes.

2 A Dynamic Panel Threshold Model

2.1 The Econometric Model

This section develops a dynamic panel threshold model that extends Hansen's (1999) original static set up by endogenous regressors. In our empirical application where we analyze the role of inflation thresholds in the relationship between inflation and economic growth ($y_{it} = dgpd_{it}$), the endogenous regressor will be initial income (gdp_{it-1}). Our model extension builds on the cross-sectional threshold model of Caner and Hansen

(2004) where GMM type estimators are used in order to allow for endogeneity. To that aim, consider the following panel threshold model

$$y_{it} = \mu_i + \beta_1 z_{it} I(q_{it} \leq \gamma) + \beta_2 z_{it} I(q_{it} > \gamma) + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{1}$$

where subscripts $i = 1, \ldots, N$ represents the country and $t = 1, \ldots, T$ indexes time. μ_i is the country specific fixed effect and the error term is $\varepsilon_{it} \overset{iid}{\sim} (0, \sigma^2)$. $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function indicating the regime defined by the threshold variable q_{it} and the threshold level γ. z_{it} is a m-dimensional vector of explanatory regressors which may include lagged values of y and other endogenous variables. The vector of explanatory variables is partitioned into a subset z_{1it}, of exogenous variables uncorrelated with ε_{it}, and a subset of endogenous variables z_{2it}, correlated with ε_{it}. In addition to the structural equation (1) the model requires a suitable set of $k \geq m$ instrumental variables x_{it} including z_{1it}.

2.2 Fixed-Effects Elimination

In the first step of the estimation procedure, one has to eliminate the individual effects μ_i via a fixed-effects transformation. The main challenge is to transform the panel threshold model in a way that eliminates the country-specific fixed effects without violating the distributional assumptions underlying Hansen (1999) and Caner and Hansen (2004), compare Hansen (2000). In the dynamic model (1), the standard within transformation applied by Hansen (1999) leads to inconsistent estimates because the lagged dependent variable will always be correlated with the mean of the individual errors and thus all of the transformed individual errors. First-differencing of the dynamic equation (1) as usually done in the context of dynamic panels implies negative serial correlation of the error terms such that the distribution theory developed by Hansen (1999) is not applicable anymore to panel data.[4]

[4]Note that in Hansen (1999) the within-transformation also implies negative serial correlation of the transformed error terms. However, this is not a problem because of the idempotency of the transformed error matrix, see Equation A.12 Hansen (1999, p366).

In view of these problems, we consider the forward orthogonal deviations transformation suggested by Arellano and Bover (1995) to eliminate the fixed effects.[5] The distinguishing feature of the forward orthogonal deviations transformation is that serial correlation of the transformed error terms is avoided. Instead of subtracting the previous observation from the contemporaneous one (first-differencing) or the mean from each observation (within transformation), it subtracts the average of all future available observations of a variable. Thus, for the error term, the forward orthogonal deviations transformation is given by:

$$\varepsilon_{it}^{*} = \sqrt{\frac{T-t}{T-t+1}}[\varepsilon_{it} - \frac{1}{T-t}(\varepsilon_{i(t+1)} + ... + \varepsilon_{iT})]. \tag{2}$$

Therefore, the forward orthogonal deviation transformation maintains the uncorrelatedness of the error terms, i.e.

$$Var(\varepsilon_i) = \sigma^2 I_T \;\Rightarrow\; Var(\varepsilon_i^{*}) = \sigma^2 I_{T-1}.$$

In accordance with Hansen (2000), this ensures that the estimation procedure derived by Caner and Hansen (2004) for a cross-sectional model can be applied to the dynamic panel equation (1).

2.3 Estimation

Following Caner and Hansen (2004), we estimate a reduced form regression for the endogeneous variables, z_{2it}, as a function of the instruments x_{it}. The endogenous variables, z_{2it}, are then replaced in the structural equation by the predicted values $\hat{z}_{2it}$. In step two, equation (1) is estimated via least squares for a fixed threshold γ where the z_{2i}'s are replaced by their predicted values from the first step regression. Denote the resulting sum of squared residuals by $S(\gamma)$. This step is repeated for a strict subset of the support of the threshold variable q from which in a third step the estimator of the threshold value γ is selected as the one associated with the smallest sum of squared residuals, i.e. $\hat{\gamma} = \underset{\gamma}{\text{argmin}}\; S_n(\gamma)$.

[5] We are grateful to Jörg Breitung for this suggestion.

In accordance with Hansen (1999) and Caner and Hansen (2004), the critical values for determining the 95% confidence interval of the threshold value are given by

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma : LR(\gamma) \leq C(\alpha)\},$$

where $C(\alpha)$ is the 95% percentile of the asymptotic distribution of the likelihood ratio statistic $LR(\gamma)$. The underlying likelihood ratio has been adjusted to account for the number of time periods used for each cross section, see Hansen (1999). Once $\hat{\gamma}$ is determined, the slope coefficients can be estimated by the generalized method of moments (GMM) for the previously used instruments and the previous estimated threshold $\hat{\gamma}$.

3 Data and Variables

Our empirical application of the dynamic panel threshold model to the inflation-growth nexus is based on an unbalanced panel-data set of 124 countries. Industrialized and non-industrialized countries are identified in accordance with the International Financial Statistics (IFS) and shown in Tables 3 and 4 in the Appendix A.1. Using data from 1950 to 2004 we extend the samples by Khan and Senhadji (2001) (1960 to 1998) and Drukker et al. (2005) (1950 to 2000). As a consequence, our sample contains more information about the growth effects of low inflation.

For each country, annual growth rates of real GDP per capita in constant 2000 prices (*dgdp*) are obtained from Penn World Table 6.2. Inflation is computed as the annual percentage change of the Consumer Price Index (π) collected from IFS. In line with the empirical growth literature, our results on the determinants of long-term economic growth will be based on five-year averages which gives us 988 observations, 227 for industrialized and 761 for non-industrialized countries.

3.1 Control Variables

Any empirical analysis of inflation's impact on economic growth has to control for the influence of other economic variables that are correlated with the rate of inflation. Following Khan and Senhadji (2001) and Drukker et al. (2005), we consider the percentage of GDP dedicated to investment (*igdp*), the population growth rate (*dpop*), the initial income level (*initial*) measured as GDP per capita from the previous period and openness (*open*) measured as the logged share of exports plus imports in GDP. These variables are obtained from Penn World Table 6.2. The annual percentage change in the terms of trade (*dtot*) is measured as exports divided by imports. Export and import data are taken from Penn World Table 6.1 until 2000 and for the later years from the World Trade Organization (WTO) database. We also included the standard deviations of the terms of trade (*sdtot*) and of openness (*sdopen*). More information about the control variables is contained in Table 2 in the Appendix. All these variables passed the robustness tests of Levine and Renelt (1992) and Sala-i-Martin (1997).

3.2 Inflation

Inflation has been lower in industrialized countries with an average annual inflation rate over the sample period of 5.86% as opposed to 33.63% for non-industrialized countries. For both set of countries, the dispersion of inflation rates is considerable, see Figures 1 and 3 in the Appendix A.2. In this case, Ghosh and Phillips (1998) strongly suggest the use of logged inflation rates to avoid that regression results are distorted by a few extreme inflation observations. Moreover, using logged inflation rates has the plausible implication that multiplicative, not additive, inflation shocks will have identical growth effects. Since our sample contains negative inflation rates, we follow Drukker et al. (2005) and Khan and Senhadji (2001) by employing a semi-log transformation of the inflation rate π_{it}

$$\tilde{\pi}_{it} = \begin{cases} \pi_{it} - 1, & \text{if } \pi_{it} \leq 1 \\ ln(\pi_{it}), & \text{if } \pi_{it} > 1, \end{cases}$$

where inflation rates below one are re-scaled for sake of continuity. In sharp contrast to the highly skewed and leptokurtic inflation data of industrialized and non-industrialized countries, the distributions of semi-logged inflation rates are much more symmetric and in line with the normal distribution, see Figures 2 and 4 in Appendix A.2.

4 Inflation Thresholds and Growth

Let us now apply the dynamic panel threshold model to the analysis of the impact of inflation on long-term economic growth in industrialized and non-industrialized countries. To that aim, consider the following threshold model of the inflation-growth nexus:

$$dgdp_{it} = \mu_i + \beta_1 \tilde{\pi}_{it} I(\tilde{\pi}_{it} \leq \gamma) + \delta_1 I(\tilde{\pi}_{it} \leq \gamma) + \beta_2 \tilde{\pi}_{it} I(\tilde{\pi}_{it} > \gamma) + \phi z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}. \quad (3)$$

In our application, inflation $\tilde{\pi}_{it}$ is both, the threshold variable and the regime dependent regressor. z_{it} denotes the vector of partly endogenous control variables, where slope coefficients are assumed to be regime independent. Following Bick (2010), we allow for differences in the regime intercepts (δ_1).[6] Initial income is considered as endogenous variable, i.e. $z_{2it} = initial_{it} = gdp_{it-1}$, while z_{1it} contains the remaining control variables.[7]

Following Arellano and Bover (1995), we use lags of the dependent variable ($dgdp_{it-1}, \ldots, dgdp_{it-p}$) as instruments. Empirical results may depend on the number (p) of instruments, see Roodman (2009). In particular, there is a bias/efficiency trade-off in finite samples. Therefore, we considered two empirical benchmark specifications. On the one hand, we use all available lags of the instrument variable ($p = t$) to increase efficiency, see Table 1. On the other hand, we reduced the instrument count to one ($p = 1$) to avoid an overfit of instrumented variables that might lead to biased coefficient estimates. According to Table 5 in the Appendix, the choice of instruments has no important impact on our results.

[6] Including time dummies in Equation (3) will not change our main results.

[7] The empirical model could be easily extended by allowing for the endogeneity of further control variables. In our application, however, standard Hausman tests indicate that the endogeneity of the

Table 1: Inflation thresholds and growth

	Industrialized Countries	Non-Industrialized Countries
Threshold estimates		
$\widehat{\gamma}$	2.530%	17.228%
95% confidence interval	[1.94, 2.76]	[12.85, 19.11]
Impact of inflation		
$\widehat{\beta}_1$	1.374^{***}	-0.121
	(0.436)	(0.117)
$\widehat{\beta}_2$	-0.391^{*}	-0.434^{**}
	(0.220)	(0.222)
Impact of covariates		
$initial_{it}$	-1.371	-1.800^{**}
	(0.950)	(0.858)
$igdp_{it}$	0.107^{***}	0.157^{***}
	(0.036)	(0.045)
$dpop_{it}$	0.290	-0.503^{**}
	(0.341)	(0.257)
$dtot_{it}$	-0.162^{***}	-0.072^{***}
	(0.036)	(0.025)
$sdtot_{it}$	-0.036	-0.007
	(0.041)	(0.020)
$open_{it}$	-0.882	0.768
	(1.080)	(0.640)
$sdopen_{it}$	0.426^{**}	0.046
	(0.213)	(0.169)
$\widehat{\delta}_1$	-0.384	0.745
	(0.511)	(1.077)
Observations	227	761
N	23	101

Notes: This Table reports results for the dynamic panel threshold estimation as described in Section 2 using all available lags of the instrument variable, i.e. $\{dgdp_{it-1},\ dgdp_{it-2},\ \ldots, dgdp_{i0}\}$. Following Hansen (1999), each regime contains at least 5% of all observations. For industrialized countries, feasible inflation thresholds are, therefore, between 1.146 and 15.668% and for non-industrialized countries between 1.002 and 66.146%. Standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table 1 shows the results obtained for industrialized and non-industrialized countries. The upper part of the table displays the estimated inflation threshold and the corresponding 95% confidence interval. The middle part shows the regime-dependent coefficients of inflation on growth. Specifically, $\widehat{\beta}_1$ ($\widehat{\beta}_2$) denotes the marginal effect of inflation on growth in the low (high) inflation regime, i.e. when inflation is below (above) the estimated threshold value. The coefficients of the control variables are presented in the lower part of the table.

4.1 The Inflation-Growth Nexus in Industrialized Countries

The results for the empirical relation between inflation and growth in industrialized countries based on the first benchmark specification are presented in the first column of Table 1. The estimated inflation threshold of 2.53% as well as the marginal effects of inflation on growth strongly support the prevailing inflation targets of many central banks. First, the 95% confidence interval ([1.94, 2.76]) of the threshold value includes 2% but does not contain 4%, the alternative inflation target recently suggested by Blanchard et al. (2010). Second, both regime-dependent coefficients of inflation are significant and plausibly signed. Inflation is positively correlated with economic growth in industrialized countries if above the threshold ($\widehat{\beta}_1 = 1.37$), while the opposite is true for higher inflation ($\widehat{\beta}_2 = -0.391$). The absolute size of the inflation coefficients suggest that correlation between inflation and economic growth of industrialized countries is stronger when inflation is low. According to the 95% confidence intervals, this conclusion holds at least for inflation rates "below but close to 2%".

It is worth emphasizing that our results are robust with respect to the choice of instruments, see Table 5 in the Appendix. The only notable exception refers to the confidence interval of the inflation threshold. If the instrument count is reduced to one, estimation is less efficient and the 95% confidence interval of the inflation threshold widens to [1.38, 5.50]. As a consequence, the evidence on the long-run growth effects of inflation

remaining control variables is not an issue. Results of Hausman tests are not presented but are available on request.

rates around 4% must be viewed with caution.

4.2 The Inflation-Growth Nexus in Non-Industrialized Countries

The results for non-industrialized countries are shown in the second column of Table 1. They differ from those obtained for industrialized countries in two important aspects. First, the estimated threshold level of inflation (17.2%) is definitely higher than in industrialized countries. The 95% confidence interval indicates that the critical value of inflation for non-industrialized countries is clearly lower than the 40% proposed by Bruno and Easterly (1998). According to our estimates, even inflation rates above 12.85% may already be seen as "too high". The higher inflation threshold for non-industrialized countries could be explained by the widespread use of indexation systems, which many non-industrialized countries have adopted due to a long history of inflation. These indexation systems may partially reduce the adverse effects of inflation. Following e.g. Khan and Senhadji (2001), higher inflation thresholds in non-industrialized countries may also be related to a convergence process and the Balassa-Samuelson effect. The coefficient of inflation ($\widehat{\beta}_2$=-0.434) is significant and plausibly signed when inflation gets above its threshold. Therefore we find clear evidence suggesting that high inflation rates in non-industrialized countries come along with lower growth rates.[8]

The second important difference between the empirical results obtained for industrialized and non-industrialized countries refers to the correlation between growth and inflation when inflation is below its threshold. While the inflation coefficient in industrial countries has been significant for low inflation rates and large in absolute terms relative to high inflation, this is not true for the low-inflation regime in developing countries. The corresponding estimate, $\widehat{\beta}_1 = -0.12$, is small and far from significant for non-industrialized countries.

For non-industrialized countries, the effect of the instrument variables on the estimated

[8]By contrast, Drukker et al. (2005) find significant inflation thresholds but no significant impact of inflation on growth in any regime.

inflation thresholds is negligible, see Table 5. The reduction of the instrument count only affects the estimates for the control variables where the standard errors slightly increase.

Finally, it is worth noting that our results on the empirical inflation-growth nexus obtained from a dynamic panel threshold model broadly confirm earlier findings based on models that should have suffered from an endogeneity bias, compare Khan and Senhadji (2001) and Bick (2010). Apparently, in our application accounting for the endogeneity of control variables does not have a major impact on the estimated thresholds. In other application, however, avoiding the endogeneity bias in a panel threshold model may lead to very different conclusions.

5 Concluding Remarks

This paper provided new evidence on the non-linear relationship between inflation and long-term economic growth. To that aim, we built on Hansen (1999) and Caner and Hansen (2004) and developed a dynamic threshold model that allows for endogeneous regressors in a panel setup. Applying the forward orthogonal deviations transformation suggested by Arellano and Bover (1995) ensured that the original distribution theory of the threshold model applied to static panels as in Hansen (1999) is still valid in a dynamic context.

Applying the dynamic panel threshold model to the analysis of thresholds in the inflation-growth nexus, confirmed the general consensus among economists. In particular, our empirical results suggest that inflation distorts economic growth provided it exceeds a certain critical value. However, there are important differences for industrialized and non-industrialized countries concerning both the level of the estimated inflation threshold and the impact of inflation in the various inflation regimes.

For industrialized countries, our results support the inflation targets of about 2% which are more or less explicitly announced by many central banks. Contributing to the recent discussion on the appropriate level of inflation targets stirred by Blanchard

et al. (2010), we estimated that inflation rates exceeding a critical value of 2.5% are positively correlated with economic growth while the opposite is true below that level.

For non-industrialized countries, the estimated inflation threshold is much higher, about 17%. Inflation rates above this threshold come along with significantly lower growth rates for non-industrialized countries but not vice versa. Thus, our results do not support growth-enhancing effects of moderate inflation rates below the threshold value. However, policy conclusions based on reduced form estimates have to be viewed with caution. In particular, the estimated inflation-growth nexus does not necessarily reflect causality but rather correlation. Yet, significant inflation thresholds in the empirical relationship between inflation and growth may provide a useful guideline for further research on the impact of inflation on growth.

The empirical setup of the current study controlled for the effect of further variables on growth but assumed that the level of the inflation threshold only depends on whether a country is industrialized or not. In particular for the very heterogenous group of non-industrialized countries, this assumption may be too restrictive. Lin and Ye (2009), for example, show that the performance of inflation targeting in developing countries can be affected by further country characteristics. Accordingly, inflation thresholds in developing countries and, thus, the appropriate level of the inflation target might be also country-specific. The identification of country-specific inflation thresholds in the inflation-growth nexus might provide useful information about the appropriate location and width of an inflation targeting band. We leave this extension of our analysis for future research.

References

Arellano, M. and Bover, O. (1995). Another look at the instrumental variables estimation of error-components models, *Journal of Econometrics* **68**: 29–51.

Bick, A. (2010). Threshold Effects of Inflation on Economic Growth in Developing Countries, *Economics Letters* **108**(2): 126–129.

Bick, A. and Nautz, D. (2008). Inflation Thresholds and Relative Price Variability: Evidence from U.S. Cities, *International Journal of Central Banking* **4**(3): 61–76.

Blanchard, O., DellAriccia, G. and Mauro, P. (2010). Rethinking Macroeconomic Policy, *IMF Staff Position Note* **SPN/10/03**.

Bruno, M. and Easterly, W. (1998). Inflation Crisis and Long-Run Growth, *Journal of Monetary Economics* **41**: 3–26.

Burdekin, R. C., Denzau, A. T., Keil, M. W., Sitthiyot, T. and Willet, T. D. (2004). When does inflation hurt economic growth? Different nonlinearities for different economies, *Journal of Macroeconomics* pp. 519–532.

Caner, M. and Hansen, B. E. (2004). Instrumental Variable Estimation of a Threshold Model, *Econometric Theory* **20**: 813–843.

Caselli, F., Esquivel, G. and Lefort, F. (1996). Reopening the Convergence Debate: A New Look at Cross-Country Growth Empirics, *Journal of Economic Growth* **1**(3): 363–389.

Cuaresma, J. C. and Silgoner, M. A. (2004). Growth Effects of Inflation in Europe: How low is too low, how high is too high?, *Working Paper University of Vienna* .

Drukker, D., Gomis-Porqueras, P. and Hernandez-Verme, P. (2005). Threshold Effects in the Relationship Between Inflation and Growth: A New Panel-Data Approach, *Working Paper* .

Foster, N. (2006). Exports, Growth and Threshold Effects in Africa, *Journal of Development Studies* **42**(6): 1056–1074.

Ghosh, A. and Phillips, S. (1998). Warning: Inflation May Be Harmful to Your Growth, *IMF Staff Papers* **45**(4): 672–710.

Goncalves, C. E. S. and Salles, J. M. (2008). Inflation targeting in emerging economies: What do the data say?, *Journal of Development Economics* **85**: 312–318.

Hansen, B. E. (1999). Threshold Effects in Non-Dynamic Panels: Estimation, Testing, and Inference, *Journal of Econometrics* **93**: 345–368.

Hansen, B. E. (2000). Sample Splitting and Threshold Estimation, *Econometrica* **68**(3): 575–603.

Hineline, D. R. (2007). Examining the Robustness of the Inflation and Growth Relationship, *Southern Economic Journal* **73**(4): 1020–1037.

Khan, M. S. and Senhadji, A. S. (2001). Threshold effects in the Relationship between Inflation and Growth, *IMF Staff Papers* **48**.

Khan, M. S., Senhadji, A. S. and Smith, B. D. (2006). Inflation and Financial Depth, *Macroeconomic Dynamics,* pp. 1–18.

Levine, R. and Renelt, D. (1992). A Sensitivity Analysis of Cross-Country Growth Regressions, *American Economic Review* **82**(4): 942–963.

Lin, S. and Ye, H. (2009). Does Inflation Targeting Make a Difference in Developing Countries?, *Journal of Development Economics* **89**: 118–123.

Omay, T. and Kan, E. O. (2010). Re-examining the threshold effects in the inflation-growth nexuswith cross-sectionally dependent non-linear panel: Evidence from six industrialized economies, *Economic Modelling* **Forthcoming**.

Roodman, D. (2009). A Note on the Theme of Too Many Instruments, *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **71**(1): 135–158.

Sala-i-Martin, X. (1997). I just ran two million regressions, *American Economic Review* **87**: 178–183.

Temple, J. (2000). Inflation and Growth: Stories Short and Tall, *Journal of Economic Surveys* **14**(4): 397–426.

Vaona, A. (2010). Inflation and Growth in the Long Run: A New Keynesian Theory and Further Semiparametric Evidence, *Macroeconomic Dynamics* **Forthcoming**.

Vaona, A. and Schiavo, S. (2007). Nonparametric and semiparametric evidence on the long-run effects of inflation on growth, *Economics Letters* **94**: 452–458.

A Appendix

A.1 Tables

Table 2: List of Variables

$dgdp$	Five-year average of the annual growth rate of real GDP per capita in constant 2000 prices
$dpop$	Five-year average of the annual growth rate of population
$dtot$	Five-year average of the annual percentage change in the terms of trade, where the terms of trade are measured as exports divided by imports
$igdp$	Five-year average of the annual percentage of GDP dedicated to investment
$initial$	Five-year average of GDP per capita in 2000 constant prices, from the previous period, in logs
$open$	Five-year average of log of openness, where openness is measured as the share of exports plus imports in the GDP
π	Five-year average of the annual percentage change of the CPI index
$\tilde{\pi}$	Semi-log transformed π
$sdtot$	Five-year standard deviation of the terms of trade
$sdopen$	Five-year standard deviation of openness
x	Vector of control variables: $initial, igdp, dpop, dtot, sdtot, open, sdopen$

Table 3: Sample industrialized countries

Country	t	$\underset{mean}{\pi}$	$\underset{mean}{dgdp}$	Country	t	$\underset{mean}{\pi}$	$\underset{mean}{dgdp}$
Australia	10	5.26	2.13	Japan	10	3.64	4.43
Austria	10	3.54	3.27	Luxembourg	10	3.49	3.18
Belgium	10	3.73	2.65	Netherlands	10	3.87	2.29
Canada	10	4.14	2.22	New Zealand	10	6.30	1.66
Denmark	10	5.28	2.28	Norway	10	5.03	2.89
Finland	10	5.71	2.86	Portugal	10	9.42	3.71
France	10	5.08	2.79	Spain	10	8.07	3.52
Germany	8	2.60	2.22	Sweden	10	5.21	2.14
Greece	9	10.34	3.23	Switzerland	10	2.95	1.81
Iceland	10	17.84	2.83	United Kingdom	10	5.97	2.22
Ireland	10	6.42	3.74	United States	10	4.02	2.28
Italy	10	6.71	3.06				

Notes: Average of annual inflation rates and average of annual growth rates of GDP in percent over the period 1955-2004. Source: IFS, Penn World Table 6.2.

Table 4: Sample non-industrialized countries

Country	T	$\underset{mean}{\pi}$	$\underset{mean}{dgdp}$	Country	T	$\underset{mean}{\pi}$	$\underset{mean}{dgdp}$
Algeria	7	10.58	1.40	Malawi	7	18.82	1.35
Argentina	10	199.63	1.08	Malaysia	9	3.18	4.62
Bahamas	6	4.46	1.30	Mali	7	4.76	2.02
Bahrain	6	3.54	0.71	Malta	6	3.60	5.34
Barbados	7	6.99	1.24	Mauritania	5	6.94	0.24
Benin	2	4.19	2.11	Mauritius	9	8.08	3.12
Bolivia	10	291.40	4.04	Mexico	10	22.79	2.05
Botswana	6	10.43	5.44	Morocco	10	5.05	2.37
Brazil	7	346.25	2.10	Mozambique	4	40.12	3.23
Burkina Faso	8	4.78	1.29	Namibia	5	11.24	0.61
Burundi	8	9.81	0.91	Nepal	8	8.12	1.43
Cameroon	7	7.40	1.19	Netherlands Antilles	6	4.37	0.42
Cape Verde	5	7.33	4.28	Nicaragua	7	791.09	-1.53
Central African Republic	6	5.68	-0.13	Niger	8	5.33	0.84
Chad	7	3.12	0.98	Nigeria	10	15.83	0.96
Chile	9	52.03	2.40	Pakistan	9	.67	2.70
China	7	5.01	7.30	Panama	10	2.30	2.95
Colombia	10	16.83	1.66	Papua New Guinea	6	7.95	2.45
Congo	7	7.65	1.40	Paraguay	9	12.55	1.46
Costa Rica	10	12.41	1.66	Peru	10	266.10	1.10
Cote d'Ivoire	8	6.94	0.66	Philippines	10	9.15	1.75
Cyprus	6	4.82	5.09	Poland	6	46.97	2.03
Dominica	6	5.72	2.56	Romania	7	38.33	3.35
Dominican Republic	9	12.61	2.96	Rwanda	7	10.04	1.88
Ecuador	9	23.27	1.63	Samoa	6	8.45	0.96
Egypt	9	9.08	2.89	Saudi Arabia	6	2.99	-1.84
El Salvador	10	8.19	1.05	Senegal	7	6.22	0.15
Equatorial Guinea	5	12.60	10.96	Sierra Leone	6	39.54	-1.80
Ethiopia	8	6.22	1.68	Singapore	8	2.91	4.98
Fiji	6	5.83	1.10	Solomon Islands	6	10.35	-0.36
Gabon	8	5.78	0.30	South Africa	10	8.13	1.48
Gambia	8	9.56	1.02	Sri Lanka	10	7.59	3.27
Ghana	8	32.65	7.34	St, Lucia	6	5.26	2.68
Grenada	5	4.20	2.61	St,Vincent & Grenadines	6	4.795	4.21
Guatemala	10	7.96	1.07	Sudan	6	43.18	0.48
Guinea-Bissau	3	25.81	1.30	Suriname	6	43.03	3.76
Haiti	6	13.99	0.42	Swaziland	6	11.68	2.75
Honduras	10	8.81	0.89	Syria	8	10.35	1.85
Hong Kong	8	5.98	4.72	Tanzania	8	18.27	1.69
Hungary	6	12.46	2.27	Thailand	10	4.72	4.42
India	10	7.22	2.75	Togo	7	6.43	-1.46
Indonesia	8	53.61	3.53	Tonga	6	8.63	4.13
Iran	9	14.27	2.10	Trinidad &Tobago	10	7.23	3.55
Israel	9	39.92	2.75	Tunisia	7	4.73	3.27
Jamaica	9	15.29	0.80	Turkey	10	36.64	2.46
Jordan	7	6.81	-0.47	Uganda	5	48.62	1.63
Kenya	9	10.19	0.28	Uruguay	10	45.95	0.92
Korea	7	8.85	6.07	Venezuela	10	17.90	0.56
Kuwait	6	2.77	0.94	Zambia	7	35.67	0.21
Lesotho	6	12.93	3.25	Zimbabwe	8	37.10	0.54
Madagascar	8	12.46	-1.23				

Notes: Average of annual inflation rates and average of annual growth rates of GDP in percent over the period 1955-2004. Source: IFS, Penn World Table 6.2.

Table 5: Inflation thresholds and growth - Estimation with reduced instrument count

	Industrialized Countries	Non-Industrialized Countries
Threshold estimates		
$\widehat{\gamma}$	2.530%	17.228%
95% confidence interval	[1.38, 5.50]	[12.87, 19.11]
Impact of inflation		
$\widehat{\beta}_1$	1.280^{***}	-0.141
	(0.520)	(0.121)
$\widehat{\beta}_2$	-0.531^{*}	-0.494^{**}
	(0.312)	(0.221)
Impact of covariates		
$initial_{it}$	-3.543	-1.761
	(2.731)	(1.240)
$igdp_{it}$	0.093^{***}	0.156^{***}
	(0.030)	(0.048)
$dpop_{it}$	0.101	-0.503
	(0.387)	(0.350)
$dtot_{it}$	-0.150^{***}	-0.072^{***}
	(0.043)	(0.028)
$sdtot_{it}$	-0.003	-0.006
	(0.057)	(0.023)
$open_{it}$	1.361	0.733
	(3.311)	(0.866)
$sdopen_{it}$	0.287	0.050
	(0.288)	(0.188)
$\widehat{\delta}_1$	-0.523	0.753
	(0.607)	(1.199)
Observations	227	761
N	23	101

Notes: Results for the dynamic panel threshold model (see Section 2) using only one instrument lag ($dgdp_{it-1}$). Each regime contains at least 5% of all observations. For industrialized countries, feasible inflation thresholds are, therefore, between 1.146 and 15.668% and for non-industrialized countries between 1.002 and 66.146%. Standard errors are given in parentheses.

A.2 Figures

Figure 1: Distribution of inflation rates - Industrialized countries



Notes: Five-year average of annual inflation rates (percentage points) for industrial countries, 1955-2004. Source: IFS.

Figure 2: Distribution of log inflation rates - Industrialized countries



Notes: Five-year average of annual inflation rates (percentage points) after the semi-log transformation for industrial countries, 1955-2004, see Section 2.1. Source: IFS.

Figure 3: Distribution of inflation rates - Non-industrialized countries



Notes: Five-year average of annual inflation rates (percentage points) for non-industrial countries, 1955-2004. Source: IFS.

Figure 4: Distribution of log inflation rates - Non-industrialized countries



Notes: Five-year average of annual inflation rates (percentage points) after the semi-log transformation for non-industrial countries, 1955-2004, see Section 2.1. Source: IFS.