Research Repository UCD

Title	Is macroeconomic uncertainty bad for macroeconomic performance? Evidence from five Asian countries
Authors(s)	Bredin, Donal, Fountas, Stilianos
Publication date	2007-03
Publication information	Bredin, Donal, and Stilianos Fountas. “Is Macroeconomic Uncertainty Bad for Macroeconomic Performance? Evidence from Five Asian Countries” (March, 2007).
Series	Centre for Financial Markets working paper series, WP-07-04
Publisher	University College Dublin. School of Business. Centre for Financial Markets
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/1178

Downloaded 2024-03-29T04:02:15Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)

© Some rights reserved. For more information

Is Macroeconomic Uncertainty bad for macroeconomic performance? Evidence from five Asian countries

Don Bredin
University College Dublin
Stilianos Fountas
University of Macedonia and National University of Ireland, Galway*

March 2007

Abstract

We use a very general bivariate GARCH-M model and quarterly data for five Asian countries to test for the impact of real and nominal macroeconomic uncertainty on inflation and output growth. Our evidence supports a number of important conclusions. First, in the majority of countries uncertainty regarding the output growth rate is related negatively to the average growth rate. Second, contrary to expectations, inflation uncertainty in most cases does not harm the output growth performance of an economy. Third, inflation and output uncertainty have a mixed effect on inflation. These results imply that macroeconomic uncertainty may even improve macroeconomic performance, i.e., raise output growth and reduce inflation.

Keywords: Inflation, Output growth, Macroeconomic Uncertainty, GARCH models
JEL Classification: C22, C51, C52, E0

*Address for correspondence: Stilianos Fountas, Department of Economics, University of Macedonia, 156 Egnatia St., Thessaloniki 540 06, GREECE; e-mail: sfountas@uom.gr; tel: + 30-2310-891774; fax: +30-2310-891777. The authors would like to thank Olan Henry for helpful discussions on the methodology. Any errors are our own responsibility.

1 Introduction

The issue of the welfare costs of inflation has been one of the most researched topics in macroeconomics both on the theoretical and empirical front. In fact, the recent emphasis on price stability among the world's major Central Banks, including the Federal Reserve System and the European Central Bank (ECB), is predicated on the assumed adverse impact of inflation on economic efficiency. Lucas (2000) estimates that a 10% rate of inflation reduces US real GNP by 3%. Considerable ambiguity surrounds the impact of the average rate of inflation on the rate of economic growth at the theoretical level. Furthermore, the impact of inflation on output growth may take place indirectly, via the inflation uncertainty channel. Friedman (1977) argues that a rise in the average rate of inflation leads to more uncertainty about the future rate of inflation, it distorts the effectiveness of the price mechanism in allocating resources efficiently, and thus it creates economic inefficiency and a lower growth rate of output. Moreover, inflation uncertainty by affecting interest rates also impacts on the intertemporal allocation of resources. Hence, a comprehensive empirical study that tests for the real effects of inflation should control for the impact of inflation uncertainty on output. The positive correlation between inflation and inflation uncertainty reported in empirical studies can also arise from a positive causal effect of inflation uncertainty on inflation. Cukierman and Meltzer (1986) provide a theoretical model that explains such a causal effect. In the presence of more inflation uncertainty, less conservative central bankers have an incentive to surprise the public and generate unanticipated inflation, hoping for output gains.

Early approaches to the testing of the relationship between inflation uncertainty on the one hand and inflation and output growth on the other hand, suffer from an important disadvantage. These studies did not distinguish between anticipated and unanticipated changes (the source of uncertainty) in inflation. By proxying inflation uncertainty by the moving standard deviation or variance of the inflation series, these studies measured inflation variability, not uncertainty. The development of Generalised Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (GARCH) techniques allows the measurement of inflation uncertainty by the conditional variance of the inflation series and more accurate testing of the two parts of the Friedman hypothesis (e.g., Baillie et al., 1996, Grier and Perry, 1998, 2000; Fountas et al., 2004a, Fountas and Karanasos, 2006).

Output growth might be influenced by changes in real uncertainty (arising from the variability in output growth), in addition to changes in nominal or inflation uncertainty. Macroeconomic analysis before the 1980s treated the theories of the business cycle (and its variability) and economic growth independently. However, this assumption of independence between

the variability of the business cycle and economic growth is questionable, as indicated by several theories (Bernanke, 1983; Black, 1987; Pindyck, 1991; Blackburn and Pelloni, 2004, 2006). Empirical evidence has recently emerged that corroborates these theoretical findings (Caporale and McKiernan, 1996, 1998; Henry and Olekalns, 2002, Fountas et. al., 2004b, Fountas and Karanasos, 2006, Fountas et al., 2006). This empirical evidence, though, is slowly emerging and it only applies to data from industrialized countries. A robust set of evidence in support of the relationship between output growth and its variability would provide a solid ground for the development of macroeconomic models that consider such a relationship as a fundamental building block.

The above issues relating macroeconomic uncertainty and performance can be analysed in a univariate GARCH framework where the conditional variances of inflation and output growth are estimated independently from each other and then Granger causality tests are performed to examine the relationships between pairs of variables. Alternatively, a simultaneous approach can be adopted where a bivariate GARCH-in-mean (GARCH-M) model is estimated to provide estimates of the conditional variances and at the same time test for the impact of uncertainty on macroeconomic performance. This approach has been applied recently by Grier et al. (2004) and Bredin and Fountas (2005) for the US economy and the G7, respectively. Grier et al. (2004) test for and reject the diagonality and symmetry covariance restrictions of Grier and Perry (2000) and obtain quite different results from the above authors. Bredin and Fountas (2005) also reject these restrictions for the G7 and find that macroeconomic uncertainty may even improve macroeconomic performance.

Economic theory postulates certain causality relationships among nominal uncertainty, real uncertainty, the rate of inflation, and output growth. In total, including the relationships discussed above, twelve causality relationships exist among the above four variables. The empirical evidence on many of these relationships remains scant or nonexistent, as pertains, in particular, to international data in industrialized economies. The lack of a comprehensive study of the empirical relationships among the above four variables represents the motivation for the present study.

In this paper, the relationship between macroeconomic uncertainty and performance is analysed empirically with the use of a bivariate GARCH-M model for five Asian countries on which relatively long series on inflation and growth data are available. This model is similar to the one employed by Grier et al. (2004) and is applied to quarterly data from the last forty years. Our estimated model is used to generate the conditional variances of inflation and output growth as proxies of inflation and output growth uncertainty, respectively, and to test for the effect of real (output growth)

and nominal (inflation) uncertainty on inflation and output growth. In total, four hypotheses are tested. The focus on a small set of hypotheses is chosen in order to concentrate our interest on a set of hypotheses that have considerable theoretical backing.

Our results are likely to have important implications for policymaking. In particular, the recent emphasis on price stability by many central banks around the world is predicated on the adverse effects of inflation on economic efficiency and growth. Some of these effects, as Friedman (1977) has argued, take place via changes in inflation uncertainty. It is therefore important to test for whether inflation uncertainty is indeed costly. Moreover, the emphasis on stabilising inflation may be associated with large variability in output growth and hence more uncertainty regarding the growth rate (the so-called Taylor effect predicting a trade-off between variability in inflation and output growth). This increasing output uncertainty may be associated with less output growth, thus making the empirical testing of such a hypothesis an interesting task. Our results on the effects of nominal and real uncertainty on output growth will therefore have important implications for the choice of inflation versus output stabilisation on the part of the central banks of these countries. Moreover, the Asian countries in our empirical analysis represent a good testing ground for the relationship between macroeconomic uncertainty and performance owing to the sharp rise in uncertainty in these countries following the financial crisis of 1997-98.

The paper is outlined as follows. Macroeconomic theory provides us with the predicted effects for these relationships discussed in Section 2. Section 3 summarises the empirical literature to date. Section 4 presents our econometric model and section 5 reports and discusses our results and relates them to some recent studies. Finally, Section 6 summarises our main conclusions and draws some policy implications.

2 Theory

2.1 The impact of inflation uncertainty on growth

Friedman (1977) presented an informal argument regarding the real effects of inflation. Friedman's point comes in two parts. In the first leg of the Friedman hypothesis, an increase in inflation may induce an erratic policy response by the monetary authority and therefore lead to more uncertainty about the future rate of inflation. In the second leg of the Friedman hypothesis, the increasing uncertainty about inflation distorts the effectiveness of the price mechanism in allocating resources efficiently, thus leading to negative output effects. Friedman's argument represents one of the few existing arguments on the rationalisation of the welfare effects of inflation.

The second part of Friedman's hypothesis predicts that increased inflation uncertainty would increase the observed rates of unanticipated inflation and hence will be associated with the costs of unanticipated inflation.[1] Such costs arise from the effect of inflation uncertainty on both the intertemporal and intratemporal allocation of resources. Nominal uncertainty affects interest rates (the inflation premium) and hence all decisions relating to the intertemporal allocation of resources. In a world of nominal rigidities, inflation uncertainty also affects the real cost of the factors of production and the relative prices of final goods, and therefore, the intratemporal allocation of resources. The effect of inflation uncertainty on output has been addressed formally by Dotsey and Sarte (2000). In a cash-in-advance model that allows for precautionary savings and risk aversion, they show that more inflation uncertainty can have a positive output growth effect. According to the authors' argument, an increase in the variability of monetary growth, and therefore inflation, makes the return to money balances more uncertain and leads to a fall in the demand for real money balances and consumption. Hence, agents increase precautionary savings, and the pool of funds available to finance investment increases. This result is analogous to the literature's finding that fiscal policy uncertainty is conducive to growth by encouraging precautionary savings.

2.2 The impact of inflation uncertainty on inflation

The opposite direction of causality to that examined by Friedman in the inflation/inflation uncertainty relationship has also been addressed by the theoretical literature. This literature examines the impact of a change in inflation uncertainty on the average rate of inflation. Cukierman and Meltzer (1986) employ a Barro-Gordon model, where agents face uncertainty about the rate of monetary growth and therefore, inflation. In the presence of this uncertainty, the policymaker applies an expansionary monetary policy in order to surprise the agents and enjoy output gains. This argument implies a positive causal effect from inflation uncertainty to inflation and has been dubbed by Grier and Perry (1998) the Cukierman-Meltzer hypothesis. Holland (1995) has supplied a different argument based on the stabilisation motive of the monetary authority, the so-called "stabilising Fed hypothesis". He claims that, as inflation uncertainty rises due to increasing inflation, the monetary authority responds by contracting money supply growth, in order to eliminate inflation uncertainty and the associated negative welfare effects. Hence, Holland's argument supports the opposite sign in the causal relationship, i.e., a negative causal effect of inflation uncertainty on inflation. The theoretical ambiguity surrounding this causal relationship necessitates an empirical investigation of the sign of the effect.

[1] This part draws on Huizinga (1993).

2.3 The effects of output uncertainty on inflation and output growth

The effect of output growth uncertainty on inflation has been examined by Devereux (1989). Devereux (1989) extends the Barro-Gordon model by introducing wage indexation endogenously. He considers the impact of an exogenous increase in real (output) uncertainty on the degree of wage indexation and the optimal inflation rate delivered by the policymaker. He shows that more real uncertainty reduces the optimal amount of wage indexation and induces the policymaker to engineer more inflation surprises in order to obtain favourable real effects. The prediction of Devereux's theory regarding the positive causal effect of output uncertainty on the inflation rate is borne out also in a recent paper by Cukierman and Gerlach (2003). They show that, even if policymakers target the potential rate of unemployment, inflation bias a la Barro and Gordon obtains in the presence of more uncertainty about the level of output. This result hinges on the assumption that Central banks are more sensitive to employment below than above its normal level. From a theoretical point of view, it is possible for more output uncertainty to reduce inflation. Higher output uncertainty reduces inflation uncertainty[2] and, therefore, the rate of inflation, according to the Cukierman-Meltzer hypothesis. Hence, the testable implication of these two effects combined is that more output growth uncertainty should lead to a lower rate of inflation.

The effect of output uncertainty on output growth has received considerable attention in the theoretical macroeconomic literature. However, there is no consensus among macroeconomists on the direction of this effect. Macroeconomic theory offers three possible scenarios regarding the impact of output variability on output growth. First, there is the possibility of independence between output variability and growth. In other words, the determinants of the two variables are different from each other. For example, according to some business cycle models, output fluctuations around the natural rate are due to price misperceptions in response to monetary shocks. On the other hand, changes in the growth rate of output arise from real factors such as technology (Friedman, 1968).

The scenario of a negative association between output variability and average growth can be traced to Keynes (1936) who argued that entrepreneurs, when estimating the return on their investment, take into consideration the fluctuations in economic activity. The larger the output fluctuations, the higher the perceived riskiness of investment projects and, hence, the lower the demand for investment and output growth. A similar result is obtained

[2]The negative association between inflation and output variability is known in the literature as the Taylor effect.

by the literature on sunspot equilibria (Woodford, 1990). According to Bernanke (1983) and Pindyck (1991), the negative relationship between output volatility and growth arises from investment irreversibilities at the firm level. Ramey and Ramey (1991) show that in the presence of commitment to technology in advance, higher output volatility can lead to suboptimal ex post output levels by firms (due to uncertainty-induced planning errors) and hence, lower mean output and growth.

Finally, the possibility of a positive impact of output variability on growth has been put forward by Black (1987) and is based on the hypothesis that investments in riskier technologies will be pursued only if the expected return on these investments (average rate of output growth) is large enough to compensate for the extra risk. As real investment takes time to materialize, such an effect would be more likely to obtain in empirical studies utilizing low-frequency data.

A number of recent studies based on endogenous growth caused by learning-by-doing also examine the relationship between output variability and growth. Blackburn (1999) shows that business cycle volatility raises the long-run growth of the economy. Blackburn and Pelloni (2004, 2006) examine the correlation between average output growth and its variability in an endogenous growth setup. Blackburn and Pelloni (2004) in a stochastic monetary growth model show that the correlation between output growth and its variability is a function of the type of shocks buffeting the economy. The study concludes that the correlation will be positive (negative) depending on whether the real (nominal) shocks dominate. In a richer setting, Blackburn and Pelloni (2006) use a stochastic monetary growth model with three different types of shocks (technology, preference and monetary) that have permanent effects on output due to wage contracts and endogenous technology. The authors show that output growth and output variability are negatively correlated irrespective of the type of shocks causing fluctuations in the economy.

All the theories presented in section 2 are summarised in the following Table.

Testable hypotheses-Theories	Sign of the effect
1) Inflation uncertainty Causes inflation	
Cukierman-Meltzer (1986)	+
Holland (1995)	-
2) Inflation uncertainty Causes output growth	
Friedman (1977)	-
Dotsey and Sarte (2000)	+
3) Output uncertainty Causes inflation	
Devereux (1989), Cukierman-Gerlach (2003)	+
Taylor effect and Cukierman-Meltzer (1986)	-
4) Output uncertainty Causes output growth	
Business cycle models	zero
Keynes (1936), Bernanke (1983), Woodford (1990), Pindyck (1991), Ramey and Ramey (1991)	-
Black (1987), Blackburn (1999)	+

3 The empirical evidence

Early empirical studies on the relationship between inflation and its uncertainty used the variance (or standard deviation) as a measure of uncertainty and hence measured inflation variability as opposed to uncertainty. Following the development of the ARCH approach by Engle (1982), several studies measured inflation uncertainty using the conditional variance of the inflation process. The majority of these studies tests for the impact of inflation on inflation uncertainty. The evidence on the impact of inflation uncertainty on growth is more limited and is summarised in Holland (1993). GARCH studies of this issue that represent a more accurate test of the hypothesis that inflation uncertainty has negative welfare effects are mostly based on US data (e.g., Coulson and Robins, 1985; Jansen, 1989; Grier and Perry, 2000, Grier et al., 2004). Exceptions are the studies of Fountas and Karanasos (2006), Fountas et al. (2006) and Fountas et al. (2004a) The first two studies use data on the G7 and the last one uses data on six European countries. The evidence is rather mixed. Grier and Perry (2000) and Grier et al. (2004) find evidence for a negative effect. In contrast, Coulson and Robins (1985) and Jansen (1989) find evidence for a positive and zero effect, respectively. Fountas et al (2004a) and Fountas and Karanasos (2006) find mixed evidence using a two-step approach that combines the estimation of a GARCH model with the implementation of Granger-causality tests.

The causal impact of inflation uncertainty on inflation is tested empirically using the GARCH approach in Baillie et al (1996), Grier and Perry (1998, 2000), Grier et al. (2004) and Fountas et al (2004a). Grier and Perry

(2000) and Grier et al. (2004) use only US data, whereas the rest of the studies use international data. In general, the evidence is mixed. Baillie et al (1996) find evidence supporting the link between the two variables for the UK and some high-inflation countries, whereas Grier and Perry (1998) in their G7 study find evidence in favour of the Cukierman-Meltzer hypothesis for some countries and in favour of the Holland hypothesis for other countries. Fountas et al. (2004a) also obtain mixed evidence. Finally, Grier and Perry (2000) and Grier et al. (2004) find evidence for a zero and negative effect of inflation uncertainty on inflation in the US, respectively.

The empirical evidence to date on the association between output variability and output growth is mixed. Early studies employed cross section (Kormendi and Meguire, 1985) or pooled data (Grier and Tullock, 1989) and find evidence for a positive association. Ramey and Ramey (1995) use a panel of 92 countries and a sample of OECD countries (for the 1960-1985 period) and find strong evidence that countries with higher output variability have lower growth. A similar result is obtained by Zarnowitz and Moore (1986), who divide the 1903-1981 period into 6 subperiods and compare high and low growth periods in terms of output growth variability (measured by the standard deviation of the annual growth rate in real GNP). Empirical evidence on the causal effect of output growth uncertainty (as opposed to variability) on output growth has appeared only recently. Caporale and McKiernan (1996, 1998) obtain evidence of a positive causal effect using UK and US data, respectively, supporting, among others, the Black hypothesis. Speight (1999) finds no relationship between output growth uncertainty and output growth in the UK and Henry and Olekalns (2002) find evidence of a negative effect in the US. Grier et al. (2004) finds US evidence for the Black hypothesis. Fountas and Karanasos (2006) obtain significant evidence for the same hypothesis in most of the G7. Finally, the available empirical evidence on the Devereux hypothesis is rather limited. Grier and Perry (2000) and Grier et al. (2004) find no evidence using US data and Fountas and Karanasos (2006) find supportive evidence for Italy and the UK.

4 Econometric Methodology

In equation (1) below we show the approach used to model both output growth (y_t) and inflation (π_t) simultaneously. A VARMA (vector autoregressive moving average) GARCH-M model is adopted (see Grier et al., 2004). This approach simultaneously estimates equations for both inflation and output growth and takes into account the conditional standard deviations as explanatory variables. The standard information criteria, Schwartz (SBC) and Akaike (AIC), will be used to test for the lag length for both p and q.

$$Y_t = \mu + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \Gamma_i Y_{t-i} + \Psi\sqrt{h_t} + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \Theta_j \epsilon_{t-j} + \epsilon_t \quad where\ \epsilon_t \sim (0, H_t) \qquad (1)$$

$$H_t = \begin{pmatrix} h_{y,t} & h_{y\pi,t} \\ h_{\pi y,t} & h_{\pi,t} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$where \quad Y_t = \begin{pmatrix} y_t \\ \pi_t \end{pmatrix}; \epsilon_t = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{y,t} \\ \epsilon_{\pi,t} \end{pmatrix}; \sqrt{h_t} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{h_{y,t}} \\ \sqrt{h_{\pi,t}} \end{pmatrix}; \mu = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_y \\ \mu_\pi \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Gamma_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{11}^{(i)} & \Gamma_{12}^{(i)} \\ \Gamma_{21}^{(i)} & \Gamma_{22}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix}; \Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{11} & \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{21} & \Psi_{22} \end{pmatrix}; \Theta_j = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11}^{(j)} & \Theta_{12}^{(j)} \\ \Theta_{21}^{(j)} & \Theta_{22}^{(j)} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\epsilon_t \mid \Omega_t \sim (0, H_t)$, and Ω_t is the information set available at time t. The model will be estimated using maximum likelihood subject to H_t, the conditional covariance matrix, being positive definite.

The GARCH-M approach is adopted in order to take account of the possible influence of uncertainty about output growth and inflation on average growth and inflation. The effects of uncertainty on inflation and output growth are captured by the elements of matrix Ψ. Ψ_{11} and Ψ_{21} test for the impact of output growth uncertainty on output growth and the inflation rate, respectively. Positive and significant values for these two coefficients would lend support to the Black and Devereux hypotheses, respectively. Ψ_{12} and Ψ_{22} test for the impact of inflation uncertainty on output growth and the inflation rate, respectively. Respective (significant) negative and positive values for these two coefficients would lend support to the Friedman and Cukierman-Meltzer hypotheses, respectively.

An important distinction between the approach adopted here and the vast majority of previous studies is that the present model takes account

of possible non-diagonality and asymmetry in the covariance structures. In this sense, the model follows Grier et al. (2004) who test for, rather than assume, diagonality and symmetry using US data. The conditional covariance expressed in quadratic form to ensure positive definiteness can be written as

$$H_t = C_0^{*'} C_0^* + B_{11}^{*'} H_{t-1} B_{11}^* + A_{11}^{*'} \epsilon_{t-1} \epsilon_{t-1}' A_{11}^* + D_{11}^{*'} \xi_{t-1} \xi_{t-1}' D_{11}^* \quad (2)$$

$$where \quad C_0^* = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11}^* & c_{12}^* \\ 0 & c_{22}^* \end{pmatrix}; B_{11}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11}^* & \beta_{12}^* \\ \beta_{21}^* & \beta_{22}^* \end{pmatrix}; A_{11}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11}^* & \alpha_{12}^* \\ \alpha_{21}^* & \alpha_{22}^* \end{pmatrix};$$

$$D_{11}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{11}^* & \delta_{12}^* \\ \delta_{21}^* & \delta_{22}^* \end{pmatrix}; \xi_t^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{y,t}^2 \\ \xi_{\pi,t}^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Equation (2) is the standard BEKK model augmented with the final term to take account of possible asymmetry of the impact of shocks on the conditional variances. The model is rich enough to allow us to answer the following questions. First, does the volatility in one series spillover into the volatility of another series? In equation (2), such a volatility spillover would imply a nondiagonal covariance process. In other words, it requires that the off-diagonal elements of the A_{11}^*, B_{11}^* and D_{11}^* matrices be jointly significant. Therefore, assuming a priori diagonality may lead to potentially serious problems as persistence in the conditional variance may be ignored. Second, does *bad news* lead to greater volatility than *good news*? Specifically, bad news in terms of inflation (output growth) taken as higher (lower) than expected inflation (output growth) will correspond to a positive (negative) residual. We set the model up in such a way that $\xi_{\pi,t}$ be the $\max(\epsilon_{\pi,t}, 0)$ which is the positive innovations regarding inflation or *bad news*. The $\xi_{y,t}$ is the $\min(\epsilon_{y,t}, 0)$ which is the negative innovations regarding output growth or *bad news*. If there were no asymmetry present, then the coefficient matrix D_{11}^* would not be statistically significant and equation 2 would be the symmetric *BEKK* model (Engle and Kroner, 1995).

5 Data and results

5.1 Data

We use quarterly data on the Industrial Production Index (IPI) and the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as proxies for output and the price level,

respectively. The data refer to 5 Asian countries, namely, India, Korea, Malaysia, Philippines and Singapore, and have different starting dates but all end in the first quarter of 2005. All data are taken from the International Financial Statistics published by the IMF. Table 1 lists the precise sample period in each country. We measure inflation by the annualized monthly difference of the logarithm of the price index PI [π_t =log($\frac{\text{PI}_t}{\text{PI}_{t-1}}$) $\times$ 1200] and real output growth by the annualized monthly difference in the logarithm of the IPI [y_t =log($\frac{\text{IPI}_t}{\text{IPI}_{t-1}}$) $\times$ 1200]. Summary statistics on inflation and output growth are also given in Table 1. We first test for the stationarity properties of our data using the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) and Phillips-Perron (PP) tests. The results of these tests indicate that we can treat the inflation rate and the growth rate of industrial production in each country as stationary processes. [3]

5.2 Results

We estimate the model of equations (1) and (2) using the quasi-maximum likelihood estimation proposed by Bollerslev and Wooldridge (1992). Following the estimation, we test for various nested models and report the results of these specification tests in Table 2. On the basis of these results we conclude the following. First, the statistical significance of the A^*_{11}, B^*_{11} and D^*_{11} matrices provides evidence for heteroskedastic conditional variances. The results of Table 2 indicate that these three matrices are jointly significant at the 1% level. Second, the joint statistical significance of the off-diagonal elements of the same three matrices indicates that lagged conditional variances and lagged squared innovations in inflation (output growth), tend to affect the conditional variances of output growth (inflation). More specifically, the joint significance of the off-diagonal elements of the A^*_{11} and D^*_{11} matrices at 1% implies that shocks to inflation or output growth tend to influence with a lag uncertainty about the other macroeconomic variable, i.e., output growth or inflation. Third, the joint significance of the elements of the D^*_{11}matrix at 1% leads us to conclude that the covariance process is asymmetric in all countries. Finally, the joint significance of the elements of the Ψ matrix indicates the presence of GARCH-M effects. Finally, in table 3 we report diagnostic statistics on the validity of our reported results. The values of the Ljung-Box statistics indicate the absence of serial correlation up to 4^{th} and 12^{th} order in the standardised and squared standardised residuals in both the inflation and output growth equations.

We now focus our attention on the statistical significance and signs of the elements of matrix Ψ in order to test for the four economic hypotheses

[3] Results are available from the authors upon request.

presented in section 2 regarding the impact of macroeconomic uncertainty on macroeconomic performance, namely inflation and output growth. The estimates of Ψ and the associated standard errors are reported in Table 4. Our results on these hypotheses are summarised as follows. First, regarding the effect of output uncertainty on output growth, we find evidence for a negative effect in three countries (Korea, Malaysia and the Philippines) and no effect in two countries (India and Singapore). Hence, no evidence is obtained for Black's hypothesis. Second, output growth uncertainty does not have a positive impact on inflation as predicted by the Devereux hypothesis. The only exception is India. Third, contrary to Friedman's argument, we find evidence that in all countries, except India, inflation uncertainty does not harm growth. It is interesting to note that in two of the countries in our sample inflation uncertainty tends to enhance growth, thus supporting the theory of Dotsey and Sarte (2000). Fourth, we obtain mixed evidence regarding the effect of inflation uncertainty on inflation: the effect is positive in two cases, negative in one and zero in the other two countries. On the basis of these results, we conclude that real uncertainty is quite costly in terms of loss in output growth but does not seem to be associated with an increase in inflation. In contrast, nominal uncertainty does not seem to be costly in terms of lower output growth, but somewhat costly in terms of higher inflation. In summary, these results point to the conclusion that macroeconomic uncertainty does not have an adverse impact on performance in most cases. It is noteworthy that uncertainty may even improve the performance of some economies, assuming, of course, this performance is evaluated in terms of output growth and the rate of inflation.

5.3 Discussion of results and related recent literature

Our results carry noteworthy implications for macroeconomic modeling and policymaking. Our evidence that in three of the five countries output uncertainty and output growth are related suggests that macro theorists should incorporate the analysis of output uncertainty into growth models, along the lines of recent research by Blackburn and Pelloni (2004, 2006). Moreover, in all countries of our sample where output uncertainty and growth are related, we find support for Pindyck (1991), among others, implying that output uncertainty is a negative determinant of output growth. Regarding the causal effect of output uncertainty on the inflation rate, our time series evidence provides little support to the Devereux hypothesis. It should be emphasised that the available empirical studies on the Devereux hypothesis are rather limited and include mostly US data. To the best of our knowledge the present study, Bredin and Fountas (2005),

Fountas and Karanasos (2006) and Fountas et al. (2006) are the only exceptions.

Regarding the impact of nominal (inflation) uncertainty on output growth, we obtain mostly evidence against the hypothesis advanced by Friedman that uncertainty about inflation is detrimental to growth (the exception being India). It is noteworthy that in two countries we find evidence for a positive effect of inflation uncertainty on growth, thus supporting Dotsey and Sarte (2000) and contradicting Friedman (1977). Hence, in some countries, inflation uncertainty, contrary to expectations, seems to be a contributing factor to growth. The relative mixity of the impact of inflation uncertainty on growth across countries squares with the lack of a consensus that has been established by the broad empirical research on this matter. This literature, summarised in Holland (1993), reports mixed results that are sensitive to factors such as the measure of inflation uncertainty, the chosen econometric methodology, the countries examined, and the sample period. As far as the effect of nominal uncertainty on inflation is concerned, our country-specific evidence on the Cukierman-Meltzer hypothesis is anticipated given that national central banks adjust their rate of money growth differently to inflation uncertainty depending on their relative preference towards inflation and output stabilisation.

The most closely related studies to the present work are Grier and Perry (2000), Grier et al. (2004), Fountas et al. (2004a), Bredin and Fountas (2005), and Fountas and Karanasos (2006). There are several differences among these studies. Grier and Perry (2000) and Grier et al. (2004) use US data and the simultaneous approach. Bredin and Fountas (2005) use the same empirical methodology but G7 data. Fountas and Karanasos (2006) and Fountas et al. (2004a) use the two-step approach and G7 and European data, respectively. Grier and Perry (2000) use monthly US data for 1948-1996. Out of the four hypotheses tested the authors find support only for the Friedman hypothesis. Grier et al. (2004) use monthly US data for the 1947-2000 period. They find evidence supporting Black, Friedman and Holland.

Fountas and Karanasos (2006) use monthly G7 data for the 1957-2000 period and find evidence for the Black hypothesis in most countries, and mixed evidence on the Friedman and Devereux hypotheses. Fountas et al. (2004a) use quarterly data from 1960-1999 on six EU countries and test for the effects of inflation uncertainty on macroeconomic performance in a two-step approach. They find considerable evidence against the Friedman hypothesis and mixed evidence on the Cukierman-Meltzer hypothesis. The present study differs in several respects from these two studies. First, our sample includes data on Asian countries. Second, we treat inflation and output growth uncertainty in a simultaneous framework that allows

for asymmetric effects of uncertainty. It is not surprising then that some of our results, in particular those regarding the effects of macroeconomic uncertainty on output growth, are quite different.

6 Conclusions

We have applied a bivariate GARCH-M model that allows for asymmetries in data from Asian countries to examine the effects of real and nominal uncertainty on average inflation and output growth. This methodology is quite general as it nests other simpler GARCH models and allows us to test for four economic theories associated with the Friedman, Cukierman-Meltzer, Black, and Devereux hypotheses. Our simultaneous approach that proxies uncertainty by the conditional variance of unanticipated shocks to the time series of inflation and output growth leads to a number of important conclusions.

First, contrary to popular belief, the uncertainty associated with the rate of inflation seems to have in certain cases a positive effect on output growth. In other words, Friedman's claim that inflation uncertainty can be detrimental to the economy's real sector receives very little support in our study. Second, we obtain mixed evidence in favour of the Cukierman-Meltzer hypothesis. Thus, as expected, countries are anticipated to react differently to a change in the degree of uncertainty surrounding the inflation rate. Third, we find that in most countries output growth uncertainty is a negative determinant of the growth rate as predicted by Pindyck (1991), whereas in none of our countries the effect is positive. This result has important implications for the development of macroeconomic theory as it supports the recent emphasis in macroeconomic modelling on the simultaneous analysis of economic growth and business cycle variability. It also has implications for monetary policymaking. Central banks that place excessive emphasis on price stability and allow undue variability in growth may jeopardise the growth prospects of their economies. Finally, very little support for the positive contribution of output uncertainty to inflation, i.e., the Devereux hypothesis, obtains. In summary, our results imply that macroeconomic uncertainty tends to influence macroeconomic performance. It is important to note though that macroeconomic uncertainty in several cases may even improve macroeconomic performance, as it is associated with a higher average output growth rate and a lower inflation rate.

Our consideration of a very recent sample period and data for five Asian countries and our comparison with other relevant studies that use only US or G7 data, points towards the sensitivity of the results to the methodological approach and the time period examined. Therefore, our empirical study

highlights the need for further work on the causal relationships between inflation, output growth, and real and nominal uncertainty.

References

[40] Baillie, R., Chung, C., Tieslau, M., 1996. "Analyzing inflation by the fractionally integrated ARFIMA-GARCH model", *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 11, 23-40.

[40] Bernanke, B., 1983. "Irreversibility, uncertainty, and cyclical investment", *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 98, 85-106.

[40] Black, F., 1987. *Business Cycles and Equilibrium*, New York: Basil Blackwell.

[40] Blackburn, K., Pelloni, A., 2004. "On the relationship between growth and volatility". *Economics Letters* 83, 123-127.

[40] Blackburn, K., Pelloni, A., 2006. "Growth, cycles and stabilisation policy". *Oxford Economic Papers*, forthcoming.

[40] Bollerslev, T., Wooldridge, J. M., 1992. "Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation and inference in dynamic models with time varying covariances", *Econometric Reviews*, 11, 143-172.

[40] Bredin, D., Fountas, S., 2005. "Macroeconomic uncertainty and performance: Evidence from the European Union and implications for the objectives of monetary policy", *The Manchester School* 73, s1, 58-76.

[40] Caporale, T., McKiernan, B., 1996. "The relationship between output variability and growth: evidence from post war UK data", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 43, 229-236.

[40] Caporale, T., McKiernan, B., 1998. "The Fischer Black hypothesis: some time-series evidence", *Southern Economic Journal*, 64, 765-771.

[40] Coulson, E., Robins, R., 1985. "Aggregate economic activity and the variance of inflation: another look", *Economics Letters*, 71-75.

[40] Cukierman, A., Gerlach, S., 2003. "The inflation bias revisited: theory and some international evidence", *The Manchester School* 71, 541-565.

[40] Cukierman, A., Meltzer, A., 1986. "A theory of ambiguity, credibility, and inflation under discretion and asymmetric information", *Econometrica* 54, 1099-1128.

[40] Devereux, M., 1989. "A positive theory of inflation and inflation variance", *Economic Inquiry* 27, 105-116.

[40] Dotsey, M., Sarte, P., 2000. "Inflation uncertainty and growth in a cash-in-advance economy", *Journal of Monetary Economics* 45, 631-655.

[40] Engle, R. F., 1982. "Autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity with estimates of the variance of UK inflation", *Econometrica* 50, 987-1008.

[40] Engle, R. F., Kroner, K., 1995. "Multivariate Simultaneous generalised ARCH", *Econometric Theory* 11, 122-150.

[40] Fountas, S., Ioannidis, A., Karanasos, M., 2004a. "Inflation, inflation uncertainty, and a common European monetary policy", *Manchester School* 72, 221-242.

[40] Fountas, S., Karanasos, M., Kim, J., 2006. "Inflation uncertainty, output growth uncertainty, and macroeconomic performance", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistic*s 68(1), in press.

[40] Fountas, S., Karanasos, M., Mendoza, A., 2004b. "Output variability and economic growth: the Japanese case", *Bulletin of Economic Research* 56, 353-363.

[40] Fountas, S., Karanasos, M., 2006. "Inflation, output growth, and nominal and real uncertainty: empirical evidence for the G7", *Journal of International Money and Finance*, forthcoming.

[40] Friedman, M., 1968. "The role of monetary policy", *American Economic Review* 58, 1-17.

[40] Friedman, M., 1977. "Nobel lecture: Inflation and Unemployment", *Journal of Political Economy* 85, 451-472.

[40] Grier, K., Henry, Ó. T., Olekalns, N., Shields, K., 2004. The asymmetric effects of uncertainty on inflation and output growth. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 19, 551-565.

[40] Grier, K., Perry, M., 1998. "On inflation and inflation uncertainty in the G7 countries", *Journal of International Money and Finance* 17, 671-689.

[40] Grier, K., Perry, M., 2000. "The effects of real and nominal uncertainty on inflation and output growth: Some GARCH-M evidence", *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 15, 45-58.

[40] Grier, K., Tullock, G., 1989. "An empirical analysis of cross-national economic growth, 1951-1980", *Journal of Monetary Economics* 24, 259-276.

[40] Henry, O., Olekalns, N., 2002. "The effect of recessions on the relationship between output variability and growth", *Southern Economic Journal* 68, 683-692.

[40] Holland, S., 1993. "Comment on inflation regimes and the sources of inflation uncertainty", *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 25, 514-520.

[40] Holland, S., 1995. "Inflation and uncertainty: Tests for temporal ordering", *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 27, 827-837.

[40] Huizinga, J., 1993. "Inflation uncertainty, relative price uncertainty, and investment in US manufacturing", *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 25, 521-549.

[40] Jansen, D., 1989. "Does inflation uncertainty affect output growth? Further evidence", *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 43-54.

[40] Keynes, J. M., 1936. *The General Theory of employment, interest, and money*, London: Macmillan.

[40] Kormendi, R., Meguire, P., 1985. "Macroeconomic determinants of growth: cross-country evidence", *Journal of Monetary Economics* 16, 141-163.

[40] Lucas, R. E., 2000. "Inflation and welfare", *Econometrica* 68, 247-274.

[40] Pindyck, R., 1991. "Irreversibility, uncertainty, and investment", *Journal of Economic Literature* 29, 1110-1148.

[40] Ramey, G., Ramey, V., 1991. "Technology commitment and the cost of economic fluctuations", *NBER Working Paper* No. 3755.

[40] Ramey, G., Ramey, V., 1995. "Cross-country evidence on the link between volatility and growth", *American Economic Review* 85, 1138-1151.

[40] Speight, A.,1999. "UK output variability and growth: some further evidence", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 46, 175-184.

[40] Woodford, M., 1990. "Learning to believe in sunspots", *Econometrica* 58, 277-307.

[40] Zarnowitz, V., Moore, G., 1986. "Major changes in cyclical behaviour", in R. Gordon (ed.): *The American Business Cycle*, University of Chicago Press.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Error	Min	Max
Inflation				
India	7.60	8.94	-28.58	36.52
Korea	7.94	8.15	-7.16	44.55
Malaysia	3.75	4.09	-5.44	22.62
Philippines	8.99	10.75	-21.24	62.63
Singapore	2.77	5.75	-7.77	36.76
Industrial Production Growth				
India	5.70	24.50	-79.30	66.49
Korea	10.78	11.98	-32.65	44.17
Malaysia	8.12	21.24	-76.26	106.71
Philippines	10.90	24.60	-76.29	105.33
Singapore	8.62	26.21	-59.19	57.65

All data is taken from the International Financial Statistics (IFS) of the IMF. Consumer Price Index and Industrial Production Index is used for all countries. The sample begins; 1963 quarter 1 for India, 1966 quarter 1 for Singapore, 1970 quarter 1 for Korea and Malaysia and 1981 quarter 1 for Philippines. The sample ends 2005 quarter 1 in all cases, except India and Philippines where the sample ends in 2004 quarter 4.

Table 2: Specification Tests

India	**Diagonal VARMA**	$H_0 : \Gamma^i_{12} = \Gamma^i_{21} = \theta^i_{12} = \theta^i_{21} = 0$	**[0.07]**
	No GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha_{ij} = \beta_{ij} = \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH-M	$H_0 : \psi_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No Asymmetry	$H_0 : \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	Diagonal GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha^*_{12} = \alpha^*_{21} = \beta^*_{12} = \beta^*_{21} = \delta^*_{12} = \delta^*_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
Korea	**Diagonal VARMA**	$H_0 : \Gamma^i_{12} = \Gamma^i_{21} = \theta^i_{12} = \theta^i_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha_{ij} = \beta_{ij} = \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH-M	$H_0 : \psi_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No Asymmetry	$H_0 : \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	Diagonal GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha^*_{12} = \alpha^*_{21} = \beta^*_{12} = \beta^*_{21} = \delta^*_{12} = \delta^*_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
Malaysia	**Diagonal VARMA**	$H_0 : \Gamma^i_{12} = \Gamma^i_{21} = \theta^i_{12} = \theta^i_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha_{ij} = \beta_{ij} = \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.01]**
	No GARCH-M	$H_0 : \psi_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No Asymmetry	$H_0 : \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	Diagonal GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha^*_{12} = \alpha^*_{21} = \beta^*_{12} = \beta^*_{21} = \delta^*_{12} = \delta^*_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
Philippines	**Diagonal VARMA**	$H_0 : \Gamma^i_{12} = \Gamma^i_{21} = \theta^i_{12} = \theta^i_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha_{ij} = \beta_{ij} = \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH-M	$H_0 : \psi_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No Asymmetry	$H_0 : \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.01]**
	Diagonal GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha^*_{12} = \alpha^*_{21} = \beta^*_{12} = \beta^*_{21} = \delta^*_{12} = \delta^*_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
Singapore	**Diagonal VARMA**	$H_0 : \Gamma^i_{12} = \Gamma^i_{21} = \theta^i_{12} = \theta^i_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha_{ij} = \beta_{ij} = \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No GARCH-M	$H_0 : \psi_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	No Asymmetry	$H_0 : \delta_{ij} = 0$ **for all** i, j	**[0.00]**
	Diagonal GARCH	$H_0 : \alpha^*_{12} = \alpha^*_{21} = \beta^*_{12} = \beta^*_{21} = \delta^*_{12} = \delta^*_{21} = 0$	**[0.00]**

Note: The marginal significance levels are in squared brackets.

Table 3: Residual Diagnostics

	Mean	Standard Error	$Q(4)$	$Q^2(4)$	$Q(12)$	$Q^2(12)$
India						
$\epsilon_{1,t}$	0.02	1.01	36.69	4.40	9.35	11.73
			(0.08)	(0.35)	(0.10)	(0.47)
$\epsilon_{2,t}$	-0.01	1.03	5.67	7.32	15.76	18.27
			(0.22)	(0.11)	(0.20)	(0.11)
Korea						
$\epsilon_{1,t}$	0.05	1.00	4.26	1.76	11.00	17.87
			(0.37)	(0.77)	(0.51)	(0.79)
$\epsilon_{2,t}$	-0.03	0.99	2.92	5.26	10.85	19.60
			(0.57)	(0.26)	(0.54)	(0.10)
Malaysia						
$\epsilon_{1,t}$	-0.02	0.96	5.25	1.50	34.41	6.51
			(0.26)	(0.82)	(0.10)	(0.88)
$\epsilon_{2,t}$	-0.01	0.91	0.37	4.65	13.39	13.79
			(0.98)	(0.32)	(0.34)	(0.34)
Philippines						
$\epsilon_{1,t}$	0.10	1.02	2.90	4.60	8.93	20.78
			(0.57)	(0.33)	(0.71)	(0.10)
$\epsilon_{2,t}$	0.23	0.97	2.08	6.60	9.20	14.08
			(0.22)	(0.16)	(0.69)	(0.30)
Singapore						
$\epsilon_{1,t}$	-0.04	1.00	5.25	1.50	34.41	6.51
			(0.26)	(0.82)	(0.10)	(0.88)
$\epsilon_{2,t}$	-0.03	1.02	0.32	2.72	7.40	12.05
			(0.98)	(0.61)	(0.83)	(0.44)

Notes: The numbers in brackets are marginal significance levels. $Q(p)$ and $Q^2(p)$ are the Ljung Box test statistic for p^{th} order serial correlation for the standardised residuals and squared residuals, respectively.

Table 4: The Values of the Ψ Matrix

	Ψ_{11}	Ψ_{12}	Ψ_{21}	Ψ_{22}
India	0.09	-0.82	0.80	-2.19
	(0.14)	(0.37)	(0.21)	(0.30)
Korea	-1.03	1.67	-0.85	1.87
	(0.56)	(0.99)	(0.17)	(0.47)
Malaysia	-0.05	0.15	-0.04	0.45
	(0.02)	(0.16)	(0.01)	(0.15)
Philippines	-0.97	2.93	-0.09	0.20
	(0.24)	(2.39)	(0.14)	(0.25)
Singapore	-0.07	3.37	-0.06	-0.31
	(0.13)	(0.59)	(0.04)	(0.28)

Notes: The numbers in brackets are standard errors.