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ABSTRACT
The analytical framework of this paper makes use of a hexa-variate panel vector autoregressive (PVAR) approach on balanced annual panel data from 30 sampled import-dependent developing economies for the period, 1970-2006. The variables included in the empirical PVAR model are inflation, capital accumulation, output growth rate, interest rate, exchange rate, terms of trade and import dependence. Our empirical results suggest that the long-run static impact of capital accumulation and economic growth on inflation is negative. Besides, inflation and economic growth had dampening effects on capital accumulation contemporaneously in the long run. The short-run dynamics also indicate that while it is possible for any previous disequilibrium in inflation, capital accumulation and economic growth relationship to be corrected overtime, the speed of adjustment to equilibrium is so sluggish that it will take a very long time for this to manifest. Exchange rate and money supply produce short-run dynamics that drive price levels in import-dependent developing economies. It is, therefore, recommended that in order to reduce inflation in import-dependent economies, demand management policies should be used in the short run, while macroeconomic policies should be directed at enhancing economic growth and capital accumulation in the long run.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The crucial role of capital in economic growth and development process has been recognised since the pre-Keynesian era when the classical ideology monopolised economic thinking and policy formulation. Without doubt every nation in the world today still lays tremendous emphasis on capital accumulation by stressing the need for raising the level of investment in relation to output. This emphasis is traceable to the short-term fiscal policies and long-term national development plans of both the developed and the developing economies over the past five decades.

One important trend in development process which has remained consistent since civilisation is that all developed nations are industrialized. Industrialization is associated with heavy investment financed through capital accumulation. Rapid and sustainable real economic growth is a necessary condition for economic development. Meanwhile, for this type of growth to occur, there is the need for a relatively stable macroeconomic environment which is an indicator for low risks and a condition for attracting investment and boosting entrepreneurial activities. Entrepreneurs and investors will always shy away from undertaking projects associated with high risks. By implication, even though a certain level of inflation may be important in attracting investment, as rising prices are a signal to investors that total revenue and expected return on investment are increasing, there is the need to keep inflation at manageable and attractive limits in order to propel rapid and sustainable economic growth.

The macroeconomic policy formulation challenge confronting many developing countries today is how to achieve low rate of inflation, manageable trade and balance of payments deficits, and higher saving and investment rates to finance long-run economic growth. This problem has become even more complex in today’s world of globalisation where developing countries are prone to further underdevelopment if the appropriate policy-mix is not prudently formulated and cautiously implemented. For example, a country which is experiencing astronomical rates of inflation risk suffering from low investment, low productivity, high import-dependence and worsening balance of trade and payments.

Given the scenario above, it is imperative to understand the macrodynamic interlinks among inflation, capital accumulation and economic growth. This is because while theoretical literature is quite emphatic about the relationship existing among inflation, capital
accumulation and economic growth, empirical literature is still ambiguous on the impact, direction, and the strength of the relationship across countries, regions and empirical methodology. This paper, therefore, aims at ascertaining the empirical case for import-dependent developing countries within the context of panel vector autoregression. The findings of this paper are of significant contribution to literature since it is novel by exploring the implications of inflation, capital accumulation, and economic growth in import-dependent developing economies. The essence of focusing on import-dependent developing economies lies in the fact that these economies have a unique problem as far as the implications of inflation for capital accumulation and economic growth are concerned. First, the rate of inflation in any typical import-dependent country can be decomposed into two: self-inflicted and imported inflation. Second, import-dependent countries are net consumers with low rates of capital accumulation which culminates in low production. Third, import-dependent developing economies that those whose macroeconomic fundamentals are not generally strong and stable since they are small-open and price-takers in the international market and, hence there is a higher possibility that inflation might have more devastating effects on these economies.

The next section of this paper discusses the trends in economic growth, investment and inflation in developing countries, whilst the literature review and theoretical framework are presented in Section 3. In Section 4, issues related to the type and sources of data, the specification of the empirical model and the methodology are presented. Section 5 presents the empirical findings whilst Section 6 discusses the results. Section 7 concludes and provides some policy guidelines.

2.0 GROWTH, INVESTMENT AND INFLATIONARY EXPERIENCES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Figure 1 below shows the real GDP growth rates of the 30 countries included in the panel\(^1\) on regional basis. The real GDP growth rates clearly show that countries in East Asia and the Pacific (EAP) region experienced the highest economic growth rates whilst those in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) experienced the least growth rates during between 1970 and 2005. Apart from EAP which recorded real growth of about 13.4 percent, none of the

\(^1\) See the Appendix for the list of countries included in the panel.
sub-regions recorded an average growth rate beyond 10 percent for the three and half decades. Clearly, these import-dependent economies failed to exhibit any consistent growth path for the past 35 years. This, notwithstanding, the sub-region which recorded the most inconsistent real growth is the LAC especially for the period between 1975 and 2004.

Source: Authors’ design based on data from the World Bank (WDI 2007)

The trends in the investment/GDP ratio are shown in Figure 2 below. Generally, there has not been a consistent investment growing trend in any of the sub-regions. EAP countries,
however, witnessed a more robust and consistently increasing investment/GDP growth trend particularly from the 1990s. Countries from LAC and Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) recorded low growth in investment/GDP ratio over the 35-year period. In fact, the investment/GDP growth trends of LAC and SSA are approximately the same during the period under consideration, except for the 1990-2002 period when the ratio for LAC countries was slightly above that of SSA countries. A clearly observed pattern from Table 1 and Figure 1 is that, across import-dependent developing economies, EAP region which experienced the highest real growth is the same region that recorded the highest investment. This is an indication that there is an apparent direct relationship between investment and economic growth. This revelation has provided a further incentive for a rigorous analysis of the macroeconomic dynamic interlinks among inflation, capital accumulation and economic in import-dependent economies.

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Capital Accumulation and Economic Growth

Generally, economists agree that the stock of capital of a nation increases through the process of net investment. Once capital accumulation enhances the production capacity of a nation, there is no gainsaying its critical role in growth and development process of an economy cannot be underestimated. It is this simple notion that formed the basis of virtually all growth models that have emerged since the era of the neoclassical school. Barro (1991), Levine and Renelt (1992) and Ahortor and Adenutsi (2009) have provided evidence that investment out of capital accumulation is one of the most important determinants of long-run growth across countries.

From the standpoint of development economists, it is generally believed that capital accumulation is the springboard for the escape of low level equilibrium trap involving a vicious cycle of poverty. For instance, Rostow (1960) observes that for the process of economic development to actually take-off, there is the need for sustained growth in terms of critical growth in the ratio of investment to national income. Similarly, Lewis (1955) asserts that the process of economic development involves transforming an economy from the status
of a 5-percent saver and investor to that which is saving and investing at least 12% of its net income.

On refining the general works of Neoclassicals and Keynesians, as well as the specific works of Harrod (1939, 1948) and Domar (1946) growth models, Solow (1956) opens a new chapter in development economics by pioneering an economic growth model based on the assumption that increasing capital accumulation, population and technical efficiency are the sources of economic growth. Even though the Solow model was criticised on the grounds of its over-simplicity for ignoring many other factors and for the prediction that all economies would eventually grow at the same rate, the role of the three factors identified by Solow as propellers of economic growth has not been doubted. Hence, Arrow (1962) and Solow (1986) made some modifications to the original model by incorporating human capital or knowledge into the growth model.

Many of the empirical studies on the determinants of economic growth examined the impact of a set of macroeconomic variables including governance, investment, international trade, government expenditure, financial sector development and foreign capital inflows. The general conclusions from these studies are that investment and economic growth have a positive robust relationship with the former often determining the latter (Levine and Renelt, 1992). Thus, the relationship between investment and growth may be uni-directional from either side or bi-directional. Probably, this is what might have informed Romer (1986, 1987) and Lucas (1988) to further emphasize the role of investment in the process of economic growth under their new growth theory.

3.2 Inflation, Capital Accumulation and Economic Growth

Theoretically, it has been established that inflation causes many distortions in an economy. When prices of consumables increase, real income of households decreases and hence, they cannot buy as much as they used to buy previously. In developing economies, there is a very high possibility that inflation will discourage economic agents from saving due to the fact that money is worth today than tomorrow². In the long run, therefore, inflation

² The underlying reason for this occurrence is that, in developing economies, generally, economic agents live in an environment of constant expected upward price adjustment or given the high level of information asymmetry, expectations formed by economic agents may be not correct.
reduces economic growth because the economy needs a certain level of savings to finance investment projects which stimulate economic growth. Another devastating effect of inflation is that it makes it more difficult for entrepreneurs to plan their activities, especially with regard to how much to produce since under inflationary periods, it is more difficult to predict effective demand and the average costs of production. Furthermore, higher rates of inflation may also impair the effective functioning of financial institutions and markets as well as discourage their integration with global markets. In this regard, higher rates of inflation usually culminate in increasing the level of uncertainty with respect to future prices, interest rates, and exchange rates, which in turn increase the risks among potential trade partners, and thereby discouraging both domestic and foreign trade. With regard to commercial banking, higher rates of inflation also erode the value of the depositor’s savings as well as the value of bank loans and other financial credits; and therefore, both the propensity to save and lend money fall considerably. Accordingly, the uncertainty associated with inflation increases the risk associated with investment, production and the efficient functioning of markets.

Quite clearly, there may be direct and indirect effects of inflation on investment. By increasing transactions and information costs, inflation directs adverse consequences for long-run economic growth. For instance, during inflationary periods, nominal values become uncertain which makes investment planning difficult, and hence the reluctance of rational entrepreneurs to engage in contracts under high circumstances of uncertainties. This reluctance to enter into contracts will, in the long run, inhibit investment and, hence, undermine the growth of an economy as found by Feldstein (1982), Barro (1995), Madsen (2003), and Byrne and Davis (2004). In effect, inflation may inhibit investment resulting in financial recession (Hellerstein, 1997). In an inflationary economic environment, financial intermediaries will be less willing to offer long-term financing for capital formation and growth. Both lenders and borrowers will also be less willing to enter into long-term contracts. High inflation is often associated with financial repression as governments are compelled to take some actions such as price and interest rate ceilings to protect sensitive sectors of the economy. However, these controls are detrimental to long-run growth and economic development, because under this circumstance capital may not be allocated to the most efficient sectors of the economy. Economic growth may be related to uncertainty and macroeconomic instability where temporary uncertainty about the macroeconomy causes
potential investors to wait for its resolution, thereby reducing the rate of investment (Pindyck and Solimano, 1993).

Given the above, recent theoretical literature has increasingly focused on the role uncertainty plays in formulating investment decisions (Dixit and Pindyck, 1994). According to Chirinko (1996) it is now well-known that the combination of the typically irreversible nature of investment, uncertainty about the future benefits or costs of the investment project, and some flexibility about investment timing, may significantly influence the investment behaviour. Specifically, therefore, there may be a benefit to be achieved by waiting in an unstable and uncertain environment which is often proxied by fluctuations in the general price level in an economy.


As macroeconomic instability is due to high rates of inflation, the likelihood of the adverse effect on economic growth is because inflation creates uncertainty about the future with regard to the outcome of private investment. Serven and Solimano (1992) in a multi-country panel data study find that macroeconomic instability in the form of real exchange rate variability or changes in general price level have a negative effect on investment.

Using a sample of countries from Asia and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Malla (1997) empirically analyzed the relationship between inflation and economic growth for these countries separately. Having controlled for labour and capital inputs, the empirical results show that for the Asian developing countries, there was no statistically significant correlation between inflation and economic growth. For the OECD countries, however, there exists a statistically significant negative relationship between economic growth and inflation. It was, therefore, concluded that there is an inconclusive or inconsistent relationship between inflation and economic growth.
Mallik and Chowdhury (2001) examine the short-run and long-run dynamics of the relationship between inflation and economic growth for four South Asian countries - Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka - using cointegration and error-correction models. Two interesting results were revealed: (i) the relationship between inflation and economic growth is positive and statistically significant, and (ii) the sensitivity of inflation to variations in growth rates is higher than that of growth to changes in inflation rates. These results imply that although mild inflation stimulates economic growth, rapid economic growth thaws out into inflation by overheating the economy. However, in more recent times, long-run empirical evidences seem to suggest that inflation can have positive Tobin-effects by causing significant reduction in interest rates and thereby promoting growth through increased investment (Ahmed and Rogers, 2000; Rapach, 2003; Rapach and Wohar, 2005; Lioui and Poncet, 2008).

Taking Brazil as an example of a country experiencing high rates of inflation, Faria and Carneiro (2001) examine the inflation-economic growth nexus using annual data for the period 1980 and 1995 within the framework of a vector autoregression. The findings suggest that although the relationship between inflation and economic growth was negative in the short run, inflation does not affect economic growth in the long run.

Khan and Senhadji (2001) investigate the inflation-growth relationship for two groups of countries classified as industrial and developing with focus on threshold effects using an econometric methodological approach originally developed by Chan and Tsay (1998) and Hansen (1999, 2000). The dataset used was on 140 countries which generally covered the period 1960-1998. The results of this study reveal the presence of threshold beyond which inflation exerts a negative effect on growth, but rates of inflation below the threshold have no effects on growth. Specifically, the results suggest that threshold is far higher for developing countries than the industrialised countries and averaged between 11-12 percent and 1-3 percent respectively.

Sweidan (2004) analyzes the Jordan economy to determine if the relationship between inflation and economic growth has a structural breakpoint during the 1970-2003 period. The results point to the fact that there is a significant positive relationship between inflation rate of below 2 percent and economic growth. Besides, a structural-breakpoint effect occurs at an
inflation rate equal to 2 percent. Beyond this threshold level, inflation negatively affects economic growth.

From the empirical results reviewed above, it is quite clear that the impact of inflation on growth and investment is inconclusive. It suggests that the issue of inflation-growth nexus is not straightforward, and this can only be resolved under some unique contexts. For instance, the empirical model and analytical framework could be of some significance just as the underlying fundamental macroeconomic differences such as whether or not a country is small-open or large-open as well as import-dependent or a net exporter. Besides, the rate of inflation and capital accumulation process could be of some relevance in explaining the actual correlation existing between inflation, capital accumulation and growth in an economy.

3.3 Theoretical Framework

From the literature reviewed, there is no single existing theory sufficiently exhaustive to address the issue at hand. Therefore, we develop a unique dynamic general equilibrium model, which takes its root from the perspective of monetarism and supply-side economics, to constitute the theoretical framework. The premise of this theoretical framework and the ultimate mechanism that drives and relates the system variables in our empirical model is based on the assumptions that:

i. import-dependent developing countries have large population sizes and excess human resources\(^3\);

ii. capital accumulation is a necessary condition for technological advancement as technology-led growth is capital-intensive;

iii. import-dependent developing countries are small-open and hence price-takers in the international market;

iv. the economies of import-independent developing countries are essentially supply-constrained and hence these economies are generally deficit in aggregate supply. This

\(^3\) This is evident in the fact that developing countries are generally labour-intensive in production and at the same time, they are perennial net exports of labour due to high unemployment rates at home.
implies that although prices response to both cost-push and demand-pull factors, the origin of inflation is essentially cost-push or supply constraint-driven;

v. of the three main economic agents – private sector, public sector and foreign sector - in import-dependent developing economies, rather than the public sector, the private sector and the foreign sector play more crucial role in determining the level of investment and growth through capital accumulation;

vi. there is dynamic linkage between investment and economic growth in import-dependent developing economies; and

vii. there is a linkage between the real sector and the monetary sector, so that, given the perennial government budgetary constraints, deficit financing is a common practice, which has a direct or an indirect impact on price level and money supply.

Our model is basically an economy-wide inter-temporal dynamic framework with a representative agent feature, which seeks to establish the static long-run relationship and the short-run macrodynamic interlinks among inflation, capital accumulation, imports, economic growth, monetary aggregates and exchange rate in import-dependent developing countries. Generally, in import-dependent developing economies, rising prices of imported merchandised commodities necessitates increased demand for foreign exchange which results in the depreciation of the domestic currency. The rising prices of imported goods will most definitely result in rising prices of goods and services in a typical import-dependent economy, which is dominated by imported goods relative to locally-manufactured products, culminating in imported-inflation, if it follows a persistent trend. This persistent trend in rising domestic prices is a likely event in imported-dependent economies, given their high inelastic-demand for imports. It follows that, even if the prices of imported goods remain stable in the international market, but the domestic currencies of import-dependent countries depreciate as a result of falling prices for their export commodities, which are largely primary commodities, there would be a direct upward pressure on domestic prices in these economies, because they are small-open with irresistible demand for imports.

There is consensus among economists that, the level of investment, to a very large extent, determines the level of output and hence economic growth. Meanwhile, developing countries are generally capital-constrained with low capital accumulation for adequate productive
investment. Clearly, low investment leads to low output and hence excess aggregate demand (since aggregate supply falls short of aggregate demand) resulting in inflation in a typical import-dependent economy. Again, with low investment and low output, government tax revenue is low and fiscal budget is further constrained. In a typical import-dependent developing economy, the government, in most cases, is compelled to resort to deficit financing in the face of inadequate tax revenue, mounting external debts and hence low international credit rating which discourages further borrowing from international institutions. The other alternative source, domestic credit, is negligible given low income levels of citizens. Meanwhile, deficit financing of social welfare services and non-productive activities results in excess money supply and, therefore, inflation as predicted by the Monetarists.

From the foregoing, it has been clearly established that, in import-dependent developing economies, inflation, capital accumulation, exchange rate, money supply, imports and economic growth are inter-related theoretically. Indeed, from the exposition above, each variable is endogenous within the context of our analysis and there is no basis for imposing a structure. This is the premise for formulating our empirical model and analytical framework. Therefore, although this paper takes due cognisance of Solow’s 1956-pathbreaking work on the role of multifactor productivity in enhancing growth, within the context of this particular study, human capital and technology, are irrelevant.

4.0 DATA AND EMPIRICAL MODEL

4.1 Panel Vector Autoregressive (PVAR) Modelling

The dynamic stochastic general equilibrium framework shows the dynamic interrelationship between inflation, capital accumulation and output. The desire to make the empirical econometric model consistent with the dynamic general equilibrium theoretical framework calls for the use of a vector autoregressive (VAR) model. However, constructing a tri-variate VAR model using just the three key variables of interest will not be able to unearth the indirect relationships that are crucial for the understanding of the sluggish response of investment to inflation as noted in most empirical findings. Hence, to capture both the direct and indirect relationships between these variables, a hexa-variate VAR model is formulated.
The key variables to consider, as suggested by the theoretical framework, are inflation, investment, output, money supply, exchange rate and imports (import-dependence index which is measured as the ratio of imports to exports). The extension of the VAR model to include the aforementioned six variables is also informed by the desire to capture both the demand- and supply-side effects simultaneously.

Given the fact that the hexa-variate VAR framework requires sufficient data points, a country case study will not produce meaningful results since annual data points for a particular country will be insufficient to meet degrees of freedom requirements. Thus, this paper develops a panel VAR (PVAR) for 30 sampled import-dependent developing economies. This approach is a combination of the traditional VAR methodology with Panel Data Analysis Technique (PDAT). While the traditional VAR treats all the variables in the system as endogenous, the PDAT allows for unobserved individual heterogeneity (Love and Zicchino, 2006). The standard hexa-variate PVAR model is formulated as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INF}_{ctj} &= \beta_{0j} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{ij} \text{INF}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{ij} \text{INV}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{ij} \text{GRW}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{ij} \text{IMP}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{ij} \text{MSS}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{ij} \text{EXR}_{ct-i} + \mu_{ctj} \\
\text{INV}_{ctj} &= \beta_{20} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{2i} \text{INF}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{2i} \text{INV}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{2i} \text{GRW}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{2i} \text{IMP}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{2i} \text{MSS}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{2i} \text{EXR}_{ct-i} + \mu_{ctj} \\
\text{GRW}_{ctj} &= \beta_{30} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{3i} \text{INF}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{3i} \text{INV}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{3i} \text{GRW}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{3i} \text{IMP}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{3i} \text{MSS}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{3i} \text{EXR}_{ct-i} + \mu_{ctj} \\
\text{IMP}_{ctj} &= \beta_{40} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{4i} \text{INF}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{4i} \text{INV}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{4i} \text{GRW}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{4i} \text{IMP}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{4i} \text{MSS}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{4i} \text{EXR}_{ct-i} + \mu_{ctj} \\
\text{MSS}_{ctj} &= \beta_{50} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{5i} \text{INF}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{5i} \text{INV}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{5i} \text{GRW}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{5i} \text{IMP}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{5i} \text{MSS}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{5i} \text{EXR}_{ct-i} + \mu_{ctj} \\
\text{EXR}_{ctj} &= \beta_{60} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{6i} \text{INF}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{6i} \text{INV}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{6i} \text{GRW}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{6i} \text{IMP}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{6i} \text{MSS}_{ct-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \phi_{6i} \text{EXR}_{ct-i} + \mu_{ctj}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\text{INF}\) denotes rate of inflation measured as annual growth in consumer price index, \(\text{INV}\) stands for investment proxied by gross fixed capital formation to GDP, \(\text{GRW}\) represents annual growth in gross domestic product (GDP), \(\text{IMP}\) is a ratio of import/exports as a proxy for import-dependence, \(\text{MSS}\) denotes money supply, the exchange rate (\(\text{EXR}\)) is measured as
the value of a national currency to the US dollar, \( c \) is the panel identity or cross-country identifier, whilst \( m \) is the optimal lag length of each variable selected in accordance with the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Schwarz Bayesian Criterion (SBC). Apart from \( \text{INF} \) and \( \text{IMP} \), all the variables are in real terms.

The standard PVAR model made up of equations (4.1 – 4.6) can be succinctly put in a matrix notation as follows:

\[
X_{c,t} = A_0 + A_1 X_{c,t-1} + A_2 X_{c,t-2} + \ldots + A_m X_{c,t-m} + E_t \tag{4.7}
\]

where \( X \) is a \((6 \times 1)\) vector of system variables, \( A_0 \) is a \((6 \times 1)\) vector of constants, \( A_{1,2,\ldots,m} \) is a \((6 \times 6)\) matrix of coefficient estimates, \( E \) is a \((6 \times 1)\) vector of system innovations, while \( c \) and \( m \) are as defined above. In the presence of cointegration, the PVAR in equation (4.7) is transformed into panel vector error-correction model (PVECM) as

\[
\Delta X_{c,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \Gamma_i \Delta X_{c,t-i} + \Pi X_{t-m} + \epsilon_{c,t} \tag{4.8}
\]

where \( \Delta \) is the difference operator,

\[\Gamma_i = \sum_{j=i+1}^{m} A_j - I, \quad \text{and} \]

\[\Pi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_j - I\]

The rank of the matrix \( \Pi \) in model (4.8) determines the number of cointegrating vectors. If the matrix \( \Pi \) is of full rank, \( r = n \), the PVECM reduces to the usual PVAR in levels of stationary variables within the context of panel data. Hence, model (4.7) will be estimated instead of model (4.8). If \( \Pi \) is a null matrix, such that \( r = 0 \), the PVECM represents a panel VAR in first differences, provided \( X_i \rightarrow I(1) \) (Enders, 1995, Harris, 1995). In other words, if the rank is zero, there is no cointegrating vector. This implies the variables are non-stationary and non-cointegrated and model (4.8) will be estimated in first differences provided the variables are integrated of order one. If the rank is one or more, \( 0 < r < n \), we have one or multiple cointegrating vector(s). In this case, model (4.8) becomes a PVECM.
The advantages of PVAR framework are that, first of all, it has the capacity to deal with the simultaneity problem\textsuperscript{4} between capital accumulation and economic growth, thus avoiding the difficult task of determining which variables are truly exogenous. Secondly, the PVAR framework allows for different economic and institutional arrangements in each country. Thirdly, this framework allows the econometrician to identify not only the short-run effects but also the long-run cumulative effects of inflation on capital accumulation and economic growth by allowing for interactions among these variables, including both the contemporaneous correlation and the dynamic feedback. This particular merit attributable to our empirical model is highly essential for the analytical framework because the transmission role in the inflation-growth nexus since investment might have a sluggish response to inflation. Finally, the PVAR captures both the stochastic patterns and co-movements of macroeconomic variables and allows for the study of dynamics in terms of deviations from the equilibrium across countries (Kireyev, 2000; Hoffmann, 2003).

\textbf{4.2 Data and Estimation Techniques}

Annual panel data involving 30 import-dependent countries comprising 12 Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) countries, 13 Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) countries, and five East Asia and the Pacific countries from 1970 to 2006 was used in the analysis. The main source of data is the 2008 edition of the \textit{International Financial Statistics Yearbook} published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Sample selection into panel was based on data availability and import-dependency. Whilst the lower study period was largely dependent on data availability, upper study period was guided by two critical facts – the use of balanced panel and hence uniform availability data among selected countries, and that the fact that there is a likelihood of paradigm shift in monetary policy framework for suppressing price fluctuations in developing countries after the year 2006 due to the ever-increasing interest in adopting inflation-targeting\textsuperscript{5}.

\textsuperscript{4} It must also be noted that although the behavioural model (4.1 – 5.6) under traditional simultaneous equation estimation technique requires order and rank identification, we proceeded to specify and estimate a PVAR model which does not suffer from any serious simultaneity bias in view of the fact that the system equations are independently cointegrating (see Mukherjee, White and Wuyts, 2003 for details).

\textsuperscript{5} Countries like Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Tanzania have since 2003/2004 fiscal year, expressed interest and have, either started or are in the process of starting the official implementation of inflation-targeting monetary management policy. In more recent years, other countries like Bolivia, Ethiopia, El Salvador, Nepal, Mali, Sudan and Paraguay have shown interest in adopting inflation-

5.0 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

5.1 Unit Test Results

(INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE)

The panel unit root tests were conducted using three techniques: Levin, Lin and Chu (LLC), Breitung (BT) and Im, Pesaran and Shin (IPS). The results are reported in Table 1. LLC and BT statistics assume common unit root process, while IPS assumes individual unit root process. The results indicate that, at one-percent level of significance, only inflation (INF) and real GDP growth (RGDPG) were stationary at levels according to all the three statistics. The real exchange rate in its logarithmic form (LREXR) was also stationary but at five-percent significant level according to all three panel unit root test statistics. According to either one or all of the three panel unit root statistics, the import–export ratio (IMPRAT), real investment (LRINV) and real broad money supply (LRMSS) were not stationary. Indeed, all the test statistics show that LMRSS was not stationary at levels. The six system variables were all found to be stationary in first differences according to the three panel unit root tests. Thus, apart from INF and RGDPG which are I(0), the remaining four variables are stationary in their first-differences and, hence are integrated of order one or I(1).

5.2 Panel Cointegration Test Results

The cointegration tests were conducted and the results are presented in Tables 2 and 3. In Table 2, the trace statistic of 111.9151 (critical value of 47.85613) indicates that the null hypothesis of the system having at most two cointegrating equations should be rejected at the

---

targeting policy. Ghana (May 2007), Thailand (May 2000), and Mexico (January 1999) have actually started the official implementation of inflation-targeting albeit with no consistent positive result as at the end of 2007.
five-percent significance level. However, the trace statistic of 8.901536 (critical value of 29.79707) indicates that the null hypothesis of the system having at most three cointegrating equations should be accepted at the five-percent significance level. Thus, according to the trace statistic, the hexa-variate system has three cointegrating equations.

Table 3 below shows that, according to the maximum eigenvalue statistic of 103.0136 (critical value of 27.58434), the null hypothesis of at most two cointegrating equations should be rejected. However, the maximum eigenvalue statistic of 7.440531 (critical value of 21.13162) indicates that the null hypothesis of at most three cointegrating equations in the system should be accepted at the five-percent significant level. The maximum eigenvalue statistics, therefore, indicate the presence of three cointegrating equations in the hexa-variate model.

The choice of appropriate number of cointegrating equations is informed by economic theory. Normalising the cointegrating relationships and imposing structural restrictions on the cointegrating coefficients reveal that the assumption of one cointegrating equation is consistent with standard economic theories underpinning the hexa-variate model. The study proceeded, therefore, to estimate the panel vector error-correction model using one cointegrating equation where normalisation was done on each of the three variables of interest: inflation, investment and economic growth.

5.3 Estimated Results of Static Cointegrating Relationships

From Table 4 below, the inflation equation shows that capital accumulation and economic growth had long-run static negative impacts on inflation. Broad money supply and import-dependency ratio had long-run static positive impacts on inflation. Exchange rate
tended to have a long-run static positive impact on inflation but this impact was not significant at the five-percent level. In the capital accumulation (investment) equation, inflation and economic growth had dampening effects on capital accumulation contemporaneously in the long run.

Broad money supply and import-dependency ratio had significant positive impacts on capital accumulation in the long run. The long-run contemporaneous impact of real exchange rate on capital accumulation was insignificant during the study period. In the economic growth equation, inflation and capital accumulation had significant long-run static negative impact on economic growth. Again, broad money supply and import-dependency ratio had significant long-run contemporaneous positive impacts on economic growth. The impact of real exchange rate on economic growth was, however, insignificant though there was a tendency for long-run contemporaneous positive impact.

5.4 Empirical Results of the Short-Run Dynamics

Table 5 below reports the results of the panel vector error-correction model (PVECM). The error-correction term (ECT) has significant negative coefficients in the inflation and economic growth equations, indicating that any previous disequilibrium in the inflation and growth equations will be corrected in the current period. However, the magnitudes of the coefficients of the ECT in these equations are small, implying that the speed of adjustment to equilibrium in the inflation and economic growth relationships is very low. The capital accumulation equation has an insignificant negative ECT coefficient, indicating that though the speed of adjustment is statistically zero, there is a tendency for any past disequilibrium to be corrected in the current period.

In the short-run inflation equation, the past level of inflation had a significant negative impact on the current level of inflation. Capital accumulation and economic growth dynamics had insignificant positive impact on current level of inflation, while import-dependency ratio had insignificant negative impact. Broad money supply had significant positive dynamic impact on inflation. Real exchange rate impacted significantly positively on inflation in dynamic terms. From the capital accumulation equation, inflation, exchange rate and import dependency ratio did not impact dynamically on investment. While the past level of
investment had a significant negative impact on current level of investment, economic growth and broad money supply had significant dynamic impacts on investment. The short-run economic growth equation (D(RGDP)) shows that the short-run dynamics of economic growth, inflation, capital accumulation and money supply did not matter over the study period. However, the real exchange rate had significant dynamic positive impact, while import-dependency ratio had significant dynamic negative impact on economic growth in import-dependent economies over the study period.

6.0 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The negative impacts of economic growth and capital accumulation on inflation in the long run point to the structurally-induced or supply-side inflationary trend in most developing economies. Thus, as structural bottlenecks are removed for investment and economic growth to take place, inflation tends to slowdown in import-dependent economies over the long run. This point is further buttressed by the insignificant impacts of capital accumulation and economic growth on inflation in the short run. The positivity of the estimated coefficients of capital accumulation and economic growth is an indication of some kind of overheating in the short run. This means that supply-side policies could not have short-run impact on inflation in import-dependent developing economies. To a very large extent, these findings are in support of the conclusions drawn by Romer (1986, 1987), Lucas (1988) and Levine and Renelt (1992).

Broad money supply impacted positively on inflation in the long run, confirming the theoretically-posited positive correlation between money supply and inflation as argued by the Monetarists. That import-dependency ratio had a positive long-run impact on inflation corroborates the view that most of the inflationary trend experienced in import-dependent developing economies are due to imported inflation. The significant short-run dynamics of inflation emanate principally from broad money supply and the real exchange rate. This suggests that controlling inflation in the short run could only be achieved by effective demand management policies.

Contemporaneously, there is a negative correlation between capital accumulation and economic growth in the long run. This means that increasing investment today may actually lead to economic slowdown today. The short-run dynamics, however, indicate that economic
growth has a positive impact on capital accumulation as predicted by the neoclassical economic growth and development models. The negative impacts of the past levels of investment and economic growth on their current levels respectively suggest that import-dependent developing economies find it difficult sustaining the level of capital accumulation and economic growth. Since these are short-run phenomena, they cannot be attributed to changes in the business cycle. The difficulty in sustaining economic growth and investment in import-dependent developing economies could be explained by the fact that these economies are bombarded continuously by external shocks, notably terms of trade and oil price shocks. This fact is supported by the empirical evidence that import-dependency ratio depresses economic growth in these economies in the short run.

Another interesting result is that, though the real exchange rate does not have any significant impact on inflation, capital accumulation and economic growth in the long run, it does have significant dampening effect on inflation and expansionary effect on economic growth in the short run. This is consistent with output gap theories and competition theories of international trade. Thus, properly realigning the exchange rate to reflect macroeconomic fundamentals in the short run can have desirable impact on inflation and growth in import-dependent developing economies.

7.0 CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was set out to investigate the empirical relationships between inflation, capital accumulation and economic growth in import-dependent developing economies. It adopted an inter-temporal optimization theoretic framework within which the representative agent derives utility from money balances and financial asset holdings. The super-neutrality of money was removed by modelling this year’s output as a function of yesteryear’s capital stock. The empirically analytical framework made use of a panel vector autoregressive (PVAR) approach on data from 30 sampled import-dependent developing economies. The key variables included in the PVAR model were inflation, capital accumulation, output growth rate, money supply, exchange rate, and import-dependency ratio. Levin, Lin and Chu (LLC), Breitung (BT) and Im, Pesaran and Shin (IPS) panel unit-root tests were conducted to determine the stationarity of the system variables. Most of the variables were found to be integrated of order one, while the rest was of order zero. Further, Larsson, Lyhagen and
Lothgren (3L) (2001) panel cointegration test was carried out to determine the long-run co-movement of the variables. The system variables were found to be cointegrated and the Granger Representation Theorem was invoked for the specification of the panel vector error-correction model (PVECM).

From the cointegrating relationships, capital accumulation and economic growth had long-run static negative impacts on inflation. Broad money supply and import-dependency ratio had long-run static positive impacts on inflation. The long-run influence of real exchange rate on inflation was statistically zero. Besides, the study has established that inflation and economic growth had dampening effects on capital accumulation contemporaneously in the long-run. Broad money supply and import-dependency ratio were found to have positive impacts on capital accumulation in the long run. Moreover, while inflation and capital accumulation had long-run static negative impacts, broad money supply and import-dependency ratio had long-run contemporaneous positive impacts on economic growth.

The short-run dynamics also indicate that while it is possible for any previous disequilibrium in the inflation, capital accumulation and economic growth relationship to be corrected overtime, the speed of adjustment to equilibrium is so sluggish that it will take a long time for any imbalance to be corrected. In the short run, real exchange rate has a positive impact on economic growth but a dampening effect on inflation. Money supply and the exchange rate generate crucial short-run dynamics for inflation relationship, while exchange rate and import-dependency ratio produce short-run dynamics that drive economic growth in import-dependent developing economies.

It is recommended, therefore, that in import-dependent developing economies,

- monetary policy such as a reduction in real broad money supply should be adopted to reduce inflation in the short run;

- supply-side policy aimed at promoting aggressive domestic production of basic essential goods should be pursued in order to reduce imports and control inflation in the long run;

- exchange rate policy that ensures international competitiveness of domestically produced goods should be pursued, while economic openness policy that ensures
availability of critical inputs for industry and agriculture must be adopted for short-run economic growth; and,

- Overreliance on imports should be reduced over the long run through aggressive export promotion and diversification as well as value addition to traditional export commodities to liberate countries from over-dependence on imports and thereby enhancing long-run growth in these economies.
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### Table 1: Panel Unit Root Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Levin, Lin &amp; Chu $t$</th>
<th>Breitung $t$</th>
<th>Im, Pesaran and Shin $t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Level 1st Diff</td>
<td>At Level 1st Diff</td>
<td>At Level 1st Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPRAT</td>
<td>-6.64646 (0.0000)</td>
<td>-1.00776 (0.1568)</td>
<td>-5.43081 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>-10.2740 (0.0000)</td>
<td>-8.18126 (0.0000)</td>
<td>-8.56026 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LREXR</td>
<td>-1.88339 (0.0298)</td>
<td>-2.14069 (0.0161)</td>
<td>-1.78144 (0.0374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGDPG</td>
<td>-8.50254 (0.0000)</td>
<td>-6.86424 (0.0000)</td>
<td>-11.7092 (0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRINV</td>
<td>-2.50938 (0.0060)</td>
<td>-0.03550 (0.4858)</td>
<td>-2.68467 (0.0036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRMSS</td>
<td>1.36409 (0.9137)</td>
<td>1.83988 (0.9671)</td>
<td>1.24994 (0.8943)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ Computations  
Note: Figures in brackets are significance probability values.

### Table 2: Unrestricted Cointegration Rank Test (Trace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized No. of CE(s)</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Trace Statistic</th>
<th>0.05 Critical Value</th>
<th>Prob.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None *</td>
<td>0.361221</td>
<td>808.1977</td>
<td>95.75366</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 1 *</td>
<td>0.193402</td>
<td>337.5916</td>
<td>69.81889</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 2 *</td>
<td>0.093449</td>
<td>111.9151</td>
<td>47.85613</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 3</td>
<td>0.007061</td>
<td>8.901536</td>
<td>29.79707</td>
<td>0.9921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 4</td>
<td>0.001371</td>
<td>1.461005</td>
<td>15.49471</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 5</td>
<td>1.97E-05</td>
<td>0.020703</td>
<td>3.841466</td>
<td>0.8855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ Computations

### Table 3: Unrestricted Cointegration Rank Test (Maximum Eigenvalue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized No. of CE(s)</th>
<th>Max-Eigen</th>
<th>0.05 Critical Value</th>
<th>Prob.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None *</td>
<td>0.361221</td>
<td>470.6060</td>
<td>40.07757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 1 *</td>
<td>0.193402</td>
<td>225.6765</td>
<td>33.87687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 2 *</td>
<td>0.093449</td>
<td>103.0136</td>
<td>27.58434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 3</td>
<td>0.007061</td>
<td>7.440531</td>
<td>21.13162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 4</td>
<td>0.001371</td>
<td>1.440302</td>
<td>14.26460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 5</td>
<td>1.97E-05</td>
<td>0.020703</td>
<td>3.841466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ Computations
Table 4: Static Cointegrating Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>EQUATIONS</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>LринV</th>
<th>RGDPG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.003920 (0.00162) [-2.41294]</td>
<td>-0.001056 (0.00044) [-2.41572]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LринV</td>
<td>-255.1240 (134.192) [-1.90119]</td>
<td>1 [-0.269375 (0.14161) [-1.90220]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGDPG</td>
<td>-947.0952 (38.9895) [-24.2910]</td>
<td>-3.712293 (0.15292) [-24.2760]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRMSS</td>
<td>333.1214 (126.508) [2.63321]</td>
<td>1.305723 (0.34363) [3.79975]</td>
<td>0.351730 (0.13308) [2.64297]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LРЕXR</td>
<td>37.02456 (92.4714) [0.40039]</td>
<td>0.145124 (0.36387) [0.39884]</td>
<td>0.039093 (0.09805) [0.39869]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPRAT</td>
<td>362.7441 (140.473) [2.58231]</td>
<td>1.421834 (0.55022) [2.58414]</td>
<td>0.383007 (0.14794) [2.58900]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>-1731.238</td>
<td>6.785869</td>
<td>1.827945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ Computations

Note: Figures in italics are standard errors, while those in square brackets are t-statistics.
### Table 5: Short-Run Dynamics (PVECM) Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECT</td>
<td>-0.008767</td>
<td>-1.49E-07</td>
<td>-0.000985</td>
<td>1.81E-06</td>
<td>-8.04E-07</td>
<td>3.90E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-2.37382]</td>
<td>[-0.11582]</td>
<td>[-19.0698]</td>
<td>[ 2.03456]</td>
<td>[-0.69743]</td>
<td>[ 0.67749]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(INF(-1))</td>
<td>-0.338227</td>
<td>4.90E-06</td>
<td>0.000139</td>
<td>-3.89E-05</td>
<td>1.68E-05</td>
<td>-1.56E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-12.0248]</td>
<td>[ 0.50008]</td>
<td>[ 0.35318]</td>
<td>[-5.75268]</td>
<td>[ 1.91851]</td>
<td>[-0.35686]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(LRINV(-1))</td>
<td>52.44247</td>
<td>-0.115899</td>
<td>-1.155461</td>
<td>0.025720</td>
<td>0.009803</td>
<td>-0.542793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ 0.49527]</td>
<td>[-3.13986]</td>
<td>[-0.78005]</td>
<td>[ 1.01037]</td>
<td>[ 0.29654]</td>
<td>[-3.29077]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(RGDPG(-1))</td>
<td>2.718009</td>
<td>0.001723</td>
<td>-0.018279</td>
<td>-0.000637</td>
<td>9.44E-05</td>
<td>0.000437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ 1.23269]</td>
<td>[ 2.24153]</td>
<td>[-0.59261]</td>
<td>[-1.20207]</td>
<td>[ 0.13717]</td>
<td>[ 0.12725]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(LRMSS(-1))</td>
<td>439.0984</td>
<td>0.182590</td>
<td>-0.849394</td>
<td>-0.042952</td>
<td>-0.022284</td>
<td>0.509507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ 3.14783]</td>
<td>[ 3.75489]</td>
<td>[-0.43528]</td>
<td>[-1.28084]</td>
<td>[-0.51168]</td>
<td>[ 2.34479]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(LREXR(-1))</td>
<td>-850.0699</td>
<td>0.023279</td>
<td>3.358109</td>
<td>-0.013813</td>
<td>-0.069252</td>
<td>-0.227453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-8.32900]</td>
<td>[ 0.65431]</td>
<td>[ 2.35202]</td>
<td>[-0.56297]</td>
<td>[-2.17333]</td>
<td>[-1.43066]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(IMPRAT(-1))</td>
<td>-25.56951</td>
<td>0.007309</td>
<td>-0.548617</td>
<td>-0.000570</td>
<td>-0.009246</td>
<td>-0.093317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.29923]</td>
<td>[ 1.06542]</td>
<td>[-1.98616]</td>
<td>[-0.12042]</td>
<td>[-1.50479]</td>
<td>[-3.04390]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>-28.20696</td>
<td>0.032172</td>
<td>0.096382</td>
<td>0.052750</td>
<td>-0.004151</td>
<td>0.003114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.41711]</td>
<td>[ 4.63649]</td>
<td>[ 0.34614]</td>
<td>[ 11.0237]</td>
<td>[-0.66791]</td>
<td>[ 0.10042]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared          | 0.214038 | 0.027070 | 0.489594 | 0.040317 | 0.009742 | 0.028221 |
Adj. R-squared     | 0.208758 | 0.020534 | 0.486165 | 0.033870 | 0.003090 | 0.021693 |
F-statistic        | 40.53771 | 4.141752 | 142.7872 | 6.253626 | 1.464506 | 4.322887 |
Log likelihood     | -8194.226 | 165.4357 | -3711.279 | 555.6257 | 281.2028 | -1406.480 |
Akaike AIC         | 15.62329 | -0.299878 | 7.084340 | -1.043097 | -0.520386 | 2.694249 |
Schwarz SC         | 15.66105 | -0.262113 | 7.122105 | -1.005332 | -0.482622 | 2.732013 |
Mean dependent     | 0.045688 | 0.037217 | -0.014013 | 0.051568 | -0.004756 | 0.008814 |
S.D. dependent     | 669.1350 | 0.209654 | 11.61576 | 0.145577 | 0.186117 | 0.937402 |

**Source:** Authors’ Computations  
**Note:** Figures in square brackets are t-statistics.
## APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Import-Dependence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>3.176619597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>2.149954179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1.098931431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1.266790767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>2.959360441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1.414313564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1.428935679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1.305077910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1.267384625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>2.059825502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>3.115193727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1.665242588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>4.203012650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>2.612145415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>1.194952870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>1.604581706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>1.819756891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>1.352621735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>2.890942999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>1.643822080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>4.050569438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>2.933656585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>1.905796979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>2.372739955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>1.593922538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>2.114087486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>1.559919866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>2.772328268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>1.358798493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>1.232345841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors*