Volume 40, Issue 3

Remittances and inflation in OPEC countries:Evidence from bias-corrected least-squares dummy variable (CLSDV) estimator

Rashid Sbia
Aix-Marseille University, CNRS, EHESS, Centrale Marseille,

Helmi Hamdi
CERGAM EA4225 Aix-Marseille Universite

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to investigate the impact of remittances outflows on inflation for a panel of 14 OPEC countries during the period 1980-2018. Using bias-corrected least-squares dummy variable (CLSDV) estimator, empirical results reveal that remittance outflows have no effect on inflation rate. However, trade openness and current account deficits have a positive impact on inflation. Further, oil price appears to not have any effect on inflation in OPEC countries.

1. Introduction

For decades, explaining and fighting inflation has been a challenge for both scholars and central bankers. Inflation may hurt the economic and social stability by reducing the value of investments and increasing the costs of living. There is vast literature explaining the sources and the determinants of inflation in order to detect the main factors behind its occurrence and to suggest adequate policy responses for fighting it. While some authors (Ubide 1997, Domac and Elbirt 1998, Chhiber *et al.* 1998, De Brouwer and Ericsson 1998, Leo 2007, Diouf 2008) have focused on the source of inflation using single country specific data, some others (Barnichon and Peiris 2007, Andersson *et al* 2009, Crowley 2010, Kandil and Morsy 2011) have investigated the issue for a group of countries or regions. In both cases the evidence is mixed, and it produced conflicting results. The aim of this paper is to contribute to the development of this literature by exploring the possible economic consequences of remittances as a new variable on inflation rate. Broadly, remittances flows are private transfers of money between countries which could affect the level of prices in hosting and receiving countries as well. Literature examined the impact of remittances on the inflation rate is recent and very limited. To the best of our knowledge, only few papers have investigated this topic. For example, a study was conducted by Narayan *et al.* (2011) to inspect the determinants of inflation for 54 developing countries using a panel data set for a short period ranging from 1995 to 2004. The authors have used the Arellano and Bond panel dynamic estimator (GMM) and the Arellano and Bover and the Blundell and Bond system generalized method of moment estimator (SGMM). In addition to the usual economic variables that may affect inflation, the authors included remittance inflows and multiple institutional variables. The results revealed that remittances inflows increase inflation in developing countries (included in the sample). Furthermore, openness, debt, current account deficits, the agricultural sector, and the short-term U.S. interest rate appeared to have a significant positive effect on inflation. An interesting result showed that progress in democracy decreases inflation. Another recent study was conducted by Termos *et al.* (2013) to investigate the impact of remittance outflows on inflation in the Gulf Cooperation Council Countries (GCC). They used three panel estimations techniques including ordinary least squares (OLS), fixed effects (FE) and Anderson–Hsiao (AH) estimator. The empirical analysis exposed that the remittance outflows reduce the inflation pressures in the GCC sending countries. They concluded that remittance outflows in the GCC countries play a role of stabilizers.

The purpose of this study is to develop the literature on the inflation-remittances relationship for oil exporting countries with special focus on OPEC countries. OPEC is an interesting case study. In fact, with globalization, the movement of labor forces around the world increased considerably, especially to rich countries seeking higher salaries and wages. In some oil rich countries such as in Kuwait, Qatar and United Arab Emirates, the stock of immigrants of local population reached a critical level: 68.8%, 86.5%, and 70% respectively (Hamdi and Sbia, 2013). Basically, the rise of oil prices generates a rise in inflation as well as a rise in remittances outflows[1]. During, high periods of high oil price, remittance outflows could absorb the excess of

---

[1] As we have seen in several OPEC countries during the past few years, an increase in oil price is followed by an increase in government spending in projects and improvement of infrastructure. In this case, the number of foreign workers increases which

money in OPEC countries and could play a role of stabilizer. While the share of remittance outflows increased during the past years, one could expect a strong relationship between inflation and remittances. Do remittance outflows decrease/increase inflation rate?

To answer this question, we use a sample of fourteen OPEC member countries observed during the period 1980-2018. The estimation technique is based on bias-corrected least-squares dummy variable (CLSDV) estimator, an innovative technique developed by Bruno (2005a; 2005b). Results reveal that remittance outflows in OPEC countries have no effect on inflation rate. Meanwhile, trade openness and current account deficits have a positive impact on inflation. We also found that oil prices do not have any inflationary belongings.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we provide a literature review on the determinants of inflation and remittances. Section 3 presents the econometric model and describe the estimation method. Section 4 and 5 display the empirical findings and the sensitivity analysis. Finally, section 6 concludes.

2. Literature Review
2.1. The determinants of inflation

Literature on the determinants of inflation has produced mixed and conflicting results either for single countries or for panel study.
For example, for country specific study, Ubide (1997) studied the determinants of inflation in Mozambique and showed that the marked tightening of monetary policy in 1996 was the ultimate reason for the control of inflation in 1996, and hence seems to correspond to a change in the fundamental trend of inflation that may have long lasting effects. Chhiber *et al* (1998) investigated the determinants of inflation in Zimbabwe from both structural and monetarist perspectives. They showed that inflation was influenced by nominal money growth, foreign prices, exchange rate, unit labor cost and real income. Domac and Elbirt (1998) studied inflation in Albania using monthly data from January 1993 to September 1997. They decomposed inflation into four components: seasonal, cyclical, trend and random. By applying co-integration and error-correction techniques they found that in the long run, inflation is positively related to both money supply and the exchange rate, while it is negatively related to real income. To fight inflation and promote the competitiveness of exports, the authors suggest reducing both the budget deficit and, concomitantly, reducing credit to the government are crucial in fighting inflation.

In the Brazilian context, Dureval (1998) studied the dynamic of chronic inflation in Brazil during the period 1968-1985 by the use of ECM. The long-run results reveal that domestic prices are determined by the exchange rate and world prices. Further, the author did not find evidence of money supply-led-inflation nor that money is a nominal anchor. However, he found that inflation increases when the rate of devaluation of the exchange rate increases and inflation decreases when output growth goes up.

---

in turn also increases the volume of remittance outflows in oil rich countries. In the opposite scenario, a decrease in oil prices led automatically to a fall in remittance outflows because the demand for foreign workers falls.

Leo (2007) studied the determinants of inflation in Iran for the period 1988/89–2005/06. By performing error correction model, he found that money has a prominent role in determining the equilibrium price level in the long run and short run. However, empirical results reveal no evidence of a structural change in the relationship between money and inflation. The author's results suggest that controlling money growth is the most important policy for fighting inflation in Iran.

For the case of grouped countries, Barnichon and Peiris (2007) examined the sources of inflation in nineteen Sub-Saharan Africa countries during the period 1960 to 2003. Using heterogeneous panel cointegration estimation techniques (GMM), they found that output gap and the real money gap both contain robust and considerable information regarding the evolution of inflation. Further, the authors showed that the real money gap plays a larger role in inflation processes than the output gap. In the European context, Andersson[2]et al. (2009) used dynamic panel estimations for the period 1999-2006. The results show that inflation differentials vis-à-vis the euro area is primarily driven by different business cycle positions and to some extent by changes in product market regulations. While external factors such as differences in nominal effective exchange rates, energy intensity and fiscal stance play a minor role. Crowley (2010) inspected the relationship between factor input costs and inflation in the Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia (MENACA) during the period 1996-2009 using different panel regression models. He found that inflation followed a perfect uniform pattern in all countries of the MENACA during the period under study. The same result was confirmed even when testing different cross sections of countries and using different estimators. The empirical analysis suggested that the pattern of inflation is explicated mainly by previous inflation, the strength of US dollar and US inflation. Further, in some countries monetary and exchange rate policies and nonfuel commodity prices played an important role. This study came out with a number of controversial results that diverge from many works in the related literature. For the author, the key one was that the changes in energy prices were statistically insignificant. This means that energy prices have no impact on inflation. This result was also confirmed using different models and subsets of countries. Ben Ali and Ben Mim (2011) evaluated the effect of both monetary and non-monetary determinants of inflation for a sample of 8 MENA countries over the period 1980-2009. The authors estimated multiples models (i.e. OLS, Fixed Effect, Random effect, GMM and SGMM) including different potential variables that may have an impact on inflation. Those potential variables were divided into 5 groups according to their kind namely: structural, business-cycle-related, openness-related, external sector and monetary variables. The results revealed a clear persistence of inflation dynamics in these countries. Further, the world inflation and NEER have significant and positive effects on domestic inflation. Moreover, a growth in money supply generates inflation. However, a strange result suggested that government spending has a negative impact on inflation. Recently, Kandil and Morsy (2011) explored the determinants of inflation in the GCC countries, using vector error-correction model including domestic and external variables that may affect inflation. The empirical analysis showed that inflation in major trading partners seems to be affecting external variables the most. Further, oil returns increased inflation by allowing credit and spending expansions.

[2]Andersson M, Masuch K and Schiffbauer M (2009) Determinants of Inflation and Price Level Differentials Across The Euro Area Countries Working Paper Series. No 1129 / December 2009.

2.2. Impacts of remittances outflows

While most of the studies have analyzed the economic costs of remittances inflows, only few studies investigated the economic costs of remittances outflows. For example, Reichart (1981) investigated the economic consequences of remittances on economy of the home country. By studying the example of Mexico workers in the United States, he considered remittances outflows as a compensation against a loss of human capital. Reichart (1981) used the term '*migrant syndrome*' to show that it impacts the production of goods and services in the economy.

For the case of Saudi Arabia, Rahman (2007) studied the various determinants of per worker remittances and their impacts on some macroeconomic variables such as economic growth, wages and interest rate. Using different causality relationships, he found a significant positive relationship between the level of per capita GDP remittances per worker. He argued that flows of remittances are pro-cyclical and their impacts depend on the economic situation of the Kingdom. Further, he found that wages have a significant positive impact on remittances meaning that the more the wages are high, the more remittances are.

In another study on Saudi Arabia case, Alkhathlan (2013) studied the impacts of remittances outflows on Saudi's economic growth during the period 1970–2010 periods. Using the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) and the error correction model (ECM) approaches. His results found a negative but statistically insignificant relationship between remittances outflows and economic growth in the long term and a negative and statistically significant relationship in the short term.

A recent paper on Saudi Arabia was published by Hathroubi and Aloui (2016) in which the authors examined the interactions between workers' remittance outflows and macroeconomic leading variables during the period 1980–2013. Using the wavelet variants approach, their findings reveal that remittance outflows are strongly associated with the main Saudi aggregates and that their relationships change across time scale and frequency bands. The authors show that government expenditures positively affect remittance shares to real outputs

The study of Taghavi (2012) was dedicated to the six Gulf cooperation countries namely: Bahrain, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Kuwait, Oman and the Emirates Arab with the aim is the study the relationships between remittances outflows and some macroeconomic variables. Using the Ganger causality test and a time span that cover the period 1990-2010, he found that the size of remittances could be deflationary and have no serious effect on economic recovery. However, he noticed that any unanticipated levels of remittances can reduce money velocity, hence slowing down the process of economic recovery. Another research by Termos, Naufal and Genc, (2013) on the GCC context, studied the effect of remittances outflows on inflation in this bloc of countries during the period 1972-2010. Using OLS, fixed effect and Anderson-Hsiao estimators, the authors find that remittances outflows are inversely related with domestic investment and consumption. The authors consider remittances outflows as a threat to monetary policy as they exert deflationary pressures. In another paper, Naufal and Genc (2018) have investigated the

impact of remittances outflows on economic growth in the Russian context over the period 1990-2015. Using a quantitative analysis based on parametric techniques, their results showed that remittance outflows have no statistically significant impacts on Russia economic as their size are relatively small compared to the Russia GDP.

In a very recent paper, Konan and N'Zué (2020) studied the relationships between remittance outflows and economic growth in Ivory Coast during the period 1975 to 2016. Using the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL), their results show that remittance outflows positively and significantly impact economic performance in the long-run. The authors recommend to the Ivory Coast government to restrict remittance outflows.

3. Data and Methodology

In our study, we used an unbalanced panel data for fourteen OPEC countries including Algeria, Angola, Ecuador, Gabon, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Venezuela[3]. The dataset covers the period 1980 to 2018. Following previous studies on the determinants of inflation, we use the basic variables[4] such as: inflation rate, economic output in constant term (2005 US $), trade as a share of GDP, current account deficit as a share of GDP, oil price, the U.S Treasury bill rate (3 months) and real remittances outflow. Data on remittances is obtained from the World Bank development indicator database (WDI 2019) except for United Arab Emirates which was extracted from the Arab Monetary Fund's online database. The other data was collected from different sources: The World Development Indicators (WDI), the International Financial Statistics (IFS) and Arab Monetary Fund online database.

Unlike Narayan et al. (2011) who used Arellano and Bond (AB, 1991) and Blundell and Bond (BB, 1998) estimators and Termos *et al.* (2013) who used Anderson and Hsiao (AH, 1981) to explore the effect of remittances outflows on inflation, we used an alternative technique based on the bias-correction of the least square dummy variables estimator. In fact, Arellano and Bond estimator reveals one weakness. Its properties hold only for N large and as a result, properties could be biased and inaccurate in panel data with a small number of cross-sectional units, which is our case in this study. The same situation occurs with other well-known estimators used to study dynamic panel model namely Anderson and Hsiao (1981) and Blundell- Bond (1998) estimators. Therefore, the bias-correction of the least square dummy variables estimator is the best alternative technique used in this paper. Recently introduced by Kiviet, (1995), Judson and Owen (1999), Bun and Kiviet (2003), it was extended by Bruno (2005) to unbalanced panels as considered in our work. This estimation method is chosen because, given the small-time span over which this study expands, it produces unbiased and consistent estimates compared to other techniques applied in the estimation of dynamic panel datasets such as and Anderson and Hsiao (AH) (1992) and Arellano and Bond (AB) (1991) (Kiviet, 1995, Judson and Owen, 1998). Using Monte Carlo estimation, Bun and Kiviet (2003) demonstrated that, in small samples, the LSDVC

---

[3] Gabon withdrew from OPEC in 1995 and Indonesia in 2008.
[4] Narayan *et al.* (2011) explained thoroughly the effectiveness of these variables as a main determinant of inflation.

estimator outperforms consistent IV-GMM estimators such as the Anderson-Hsiao and Arellano-Bond estimators.

Following Narayan et al. (2011) and Termos *et al.* (2013), the econometric model is specified as follows:

$$inflation_{i,t} = \alpha_0 inflation_{i,t-1} + \beta X_{i,t}' + \delta remit\_out_{i,t}' + v_i + \varepsilon_{i,t}; \qquad i = 1,.., N; t = 1,..,T \qquad (1)$$

Where *inflation$_{i,t}$* is the inflation rate of country *i* at time *t*; *remit_out$_{i,t}$* is remittances outflows in real term *X* is a vector of the explanatory variables; *v* is country-specific effects; and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ is the error term. As the inflation rate is negative in some periods, the model was therefore estimated using log [l+(inf /100)] as a dependent variable as. All the variables except T-bill and oil price are expressed in logarithm form. *Inf$_{i,t-1}$* is obtained by lagging $inf_{i,t}$ by one period.

4. Results

In the first stage of our analysis, we present in table 1 below some descriptive statistics about data used in this study. For each variable, we display the average, the maximum and the minimum value. From Table 1, we notice that the amount of remittances outflows in OPEC countries are huge as they represent on average 14.52% of GDP with a minimum of 7.6% and a maximum of 21.98%. Inflation in OPEC countries is very low as it represents an average of 0.16% and, it reached a maximum of 3.75%. Oil price was volatile during the period of study as its value was moving between 20.93 US dollar to 97.04 US dollar per barrel. It is noteworthy to mention that we can draw form Table 1 that current account deficit in OPEC countries is very low, which could be explained by the huge foreign reserves of oil and energy that OPEC countries have generated in periods of high oil prices.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Observation
Inflation	0.16	0.36	-0.18	3.75	535
GDP	24.73	1.00	22.49	26.66	546
Remittances Outflows	14.52	4.53	7.60	21.98	479
Trade (% GDP)	4.22	0.46	1.35	5.19	515
Current Account deficit (% GDP)	0.06	0.21	-2.42	1.07	522
Oil price	32.40	20.93	13.07	97.04	546
Tbill	5.41	3.31	0.10	14.35	546

In the second stage, we use both pooled OLS and fixed effect techniques to estimate the equation (1). This approach is for comparative purposes only. Table 3 shows the results of both estimations. The empirical results reveal that the first lag of inflation rate positively affect the current inflation rate and it is statistically significant in both estimations. This is not the case for remittance outflows, which are not statistically significant in both models. The remaining

variables are not statistically significant under the OLS estimator. However, they are all significant under the fixed effect estimator except for oil price. Moreover, the signs are different. Gross Domestic Product and U.S Treasury bill have a negative impact on inflation while trade openness and current account deficit have a positive effect. Moreover, as explained by Termos et al. (2013), estimating equation (1) using (OLS) or (FE) by including the lagged dependent variable may be problematic.

Table 2. OLS and Fixed Effect Estimations Results

	OLS		FE	
Inflation.L1	0.7699	(0.000)***	0.6229	(0.000)***
GDP	-0.0154	(0.448)	-0.4191	(0.000)***
Remittances Outflows	-0.0022	(0.578)	-0.0225	(0.114)
Trade (% GDP)	0.0287	(0.465)	0.1905	(0.003)***
Current Account deficit (% GDP)	-0.0358	(0.565)	0.1496	(0.041)**
Oil price	-0.0004	(0.577)	0.0014	(0.167)
Tbill	-0.0022	(0.643)	-0.0145	(0.014)**
Constant	0.3569	(0.548)	9.9227	(0.000)***
R^2	0.6027		0.6407	
N. Observation	448		448	

Notes: p-values are in parentheses.
* significance at 10%.
** significance at 5%.
*** significance at 1%.

In the second stage, we estimated our models using bias-corrected least-squares dummy variable (CLSDV) estimator. The different results are presented in Tables 3. We estimated multiple alternatives of the basic inflation model to check the robustness of the effect of remittance outflows on the inflation rate in 14 OPEC member countries.

In model 1, we investigate the impact of the economic output, the first lag of inflation and the real remittances outflows on the inflation rate. In model 2, we added to the model 1 variables' the trade openness as a share of gross domestic product. In model 3 to 5, in addition to the above variables, we include sequentially current account deficit as a share, oil price and U.S Treasury bill.

Table 3. LSDVC Estimations Results

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Inflation.L1	0.8109***	0.7019***	0.6938***	0.6938***	0.6938***
	(0.0624)	(0.0611)	(0.0622)	(0.0623)	(0.0623)
GDP	-0.4327***	-0.3612**	-0.4651**	-0.4651**	-0.4651**
	(0.1497)	(0.1806)	(0.2028)	(0.2028)	(0.2028)
Remittances Outflows	-0.0010	-0.0091	-0.0089	-0.0091	-0.0091
	(0.0228)	(0.0266)	(0.0268)	(0.0268)	(0.0268)
Trade (% GDP)		0.1188*	0.1425*	0.14258*	0.1425*
		(0.0801)	(0.0805)	(0.0804)	(0.0804)
Current Account			0.1917**	0.1917**	0.1917**

deficit (% GDP)			(0.1016)	(0.1016)	(0.1016)
Oil price				0.0025 (0.0022)	-0.0004 (0.0021)
Tbill					-0.0234** (0.0107)
N. Observation	520	519	519	521	523

Notes: bootstrapped standard errors are in parentheses (50 iterations; see Bun and Kiviet (2003) and Bruno (2005b)).
* significance at 10%.
** significance at 5%.
*** significance at 1%.

When analyzing the results of model 1 to 5, we can distinguish two significant outcomes. Firstly, the addition of different potential variables does not modify the sign and the statistical significance of the effect of remittance outflows on inflation. For example, through five models, we note that the effect of remittances outflows is negative and statistically insignificant. Secondly, we observed that the magnitude and statistical significance of the remaining regressors are steady throughout the different models.

In all five different estimations, lag of inflation rate has a positive sign and shows a strong statistical significance. The coefficients range from 0.6938 to 0.8109 demonstrating that present current inflation is positively and strongly related to last year's inflation rate. As for the gross domestic output it is strongly statistically significant. However, it has a negative effect on inflation. This result is consistent with the work done by Desai *et al.* (2003) which revealed a negative relationship between output growth and inflation for a panel of 100 countries. The same result found by Aisen and Viega (2006), who explored the same relationship for a panel of 75 developing countries, Recently, Narayan *et al.* (2011) confirmed a negative effect of gross domestic product on inflation rate.

Surprisingly, remittance outflows variable has a negative impact but is statistically not significant on inflation. This result is found to be inconsistent with Termos *et al.* (2013) who found that remittance outflows exert deflationary pressures in GCC economies. There are two possible explanations. The first one could be related to the estimator used by the authors, which is unreliable in the case of small sample. The second explanation is that remittance outflows amount from GCC countries is bigger compared to other OPEC countries as it has been shown in the introduction and their effect on inflation represents a special case.

Trade openness shows a positive and significant coefficient in all models where it was included. This result is consistent with cost-push hypothesis, which suggests that trade openness does not certainly decrease inflation; rather it increases it. In other words, there is a positive effect of trade openness on inflation (Alfaro, 2005; Kim and Beladi, 2005; Evans, 2007). However, empirical literature on the relationship between trade openness and inflation is inconclusive. An alternative hypothesis, spillover hypothesis, put forward that trade openness is linked with falling prices and therefore protectionism is inflationary (Musa, 1974; Romer, 1993; Lane, 1997; Gruben and McLeod; 2004).

The current account deficit as a share of gross domestic product exposes a positive effect on inflation rate and the coefficient is statistically significant. The current account deficit variable was included in 3 out of the 5 models. Our result indicates that deficit generates inflationary pressure. In comparison with the outcomes from empirical studies, Narayan *et al.* (2011), for instance, found that current account deficit increases the inflation. Termos *et al.* (2013) found that current account deficit has a positive effect on inflation but statistically not significant.

One of the most important result in this study is that the price of oil does not have any significant effect on inflation, while the U.S. Treasury bill rate has a negative and significant effect on the inflation rate.

5. Sensitivity analysis

To get a better insight into the effects of remittances outflows on inflation, we split the sample in two sub-samples. The first covers the GCC countries that are members of the OPEC. It includes Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar and the UAE. The second covers the other non-GCC countries including: Algeria, Angola, Ecuador, Gabon, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Nigeria, and Venezuela. We re-estimate the five econometric models for each bloc of countries using the same methodology. The results are displayed in Table 4 in Annex. In all models, we found similar results to those of the aggregated analysis suggesting a negative and statistically insignificant impacts of remittances outflows on inflation. It is worth recalling that most OPEC countries in our sample are pegging their currencies to the US dollar and this fixed exchange regime has contributed to the stability of the OPEC currencies and has also played a role of stabilizer despite the huge inflows and outflows of funds. As for the remaining variables, the sensitivity analysis has also shown similar results suggesting that robustness of the finding.

6. Conclusion and Policy recommendations

In this empirical research, we contributed to the literature that to distinguishes the factors affecting inflation by modeling the influence of remittances outflows on the inflation for a panel of 14 OPEC countries over the period 1980 to 2018.

To avoid finite sample bias and inaccuracy when using some estimator including Anderson and Hsiao (1981), Arellano and Bover (1995) and the Blundell and Bond (1998), we used bias-corrected least-squares dummy variable (CLSDV) estimator, recently introduced by Kiviet, (1995), Judson and Owen (1999), Bun and Kiviet (2003) and extended by Bruno (2005), to unbalanced panels. It was necessary to check the robustness of our results suggesting that remittance outflows have negative but statistically insignificant effect on inflation in OPEC countries. We could confirm our results by including different potential factors that usually affect the inflation according to the literature.

We estimated five different models and we found the remittances effect on inflation kept the same characteristics across all models. Moreover, we found that real gross domestic product exerts a deflationary pressure in the case of our sample. At the opposite, the current account

deficit, which increases the inflationary pressure. The positive effect of openness on inflation confirms the side effect of a big share of imports in the trade balance. A surprising result confirms that oil price does not have any effect on inflation in OPEC countries. For robustness check, we divided the sample in two subsamples, the first covers the GCC countries that are members of the OPEC and the second covers the remaining countries. The results are similar to the first model with the 14 countries suggesting that remittances outflows are not a strong determinant of inflation.

This study has shed light on interesting policy implications for GCC countries. As remittances, outflows have no significant effect on inflation, it is not imperative to implement policy constraining remittances. Even if foreign workers represent major share of labor market in GCC countries and may persist for decades, the share of remittances from GDP remains low as compared the wealth of these countries. Many attempts to restructure labor market aiming at increasing nationalization have failed due difficult weather and available jobs (mainly construction and services). It is noteworthy to keep in mind that GCC countries have adopted since decades free capital control with fixed exchange rate and has abandoned the monetary policy independence according to the impossible trinity.

References

Aisen, A. and F. J. Veiga (2006) "Does political instability lead to higher inflation? A panel data analysis" *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 38, 1379-89

Alfaro, L. (2005) "Inflation, openness, and exchange-rate regimes: the quest for short-term commitment" *Journal of Development Economics* 77, 229-49.

Alkhathlan, K.A. (2013) "The nexus between remittance outflows and growth: a study of Saudi Arabia" *Economic Modelling* 33, 695-700.

Al-Mutari, N., (1995) "Examining the causes of inflation in Kuwait: an application of a vector autoregression Model" *OPEC Review* 19, 137-147.

Anderson, T.W and C., Hsiao (1981) "Estimation of dynamic models with error components" *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 76, 589-606.

Arellano, M and S., Bond (1991) "Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations" *Review of Economic Studies* 58, 277-297.

Barnichon, R., and S.J., Peiris (2008) "Sources of Inflation in Sub-Saharan Africa," *International Monetary Fund Working Paper,* WP/07/32, International Monetary Fund, Washington.

Ben Ali, M.S and S., Ben Mim (2011) "What Drives Inflation in MENA Countries?" *International Journal of Economics and Finance* 3(4), 199-129.

Bernanke, Ben S., (2005) "Inflation in Latin America—A New Era?" Remarks at the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research Economic Summit.

Binici, M., and Y. W., Cheung (2012) « Trade openness, market competition, and inflation: Some Sectoral evidence from OECD countries" *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 17(4), 321-336.

Blundell, R. and S., Bond (1998) "Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models" *Journal of Econometrics* 87, 115-143.

Bruno, G.S.F., (2005a) "Approximating the bias of the LSDV estimator for dynamic unbalanced panel data models" *Economics Letters* 87, 361-366.

Bruno, G.S.F., (2005b) "Estimation and inference in dynamic unbalanced panel data models with a small number of individuals" *Stata Journal* 5, 473–500.

Bun, M.J.G. and J.F., Kiviet (2003) "On the diminishing returns of higher order terms in asymptotic expansions of bias" *Economics Letters* 79, 145-152.

Crowley, J., (2010) "Commodity Prices and Inflation in the Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia" *International Monetary Fund Working Paper,* WP/10/135. International Monetary Fund, Washington.

Desai, R. M., A., Olofsgard, and T. M., Yousef (2003) "Democracy, inequality and inflation" *American Political Science Review* 97, 391-406.

Domac, I. and C., Elbirt (1998) "The Main Determinants of Inflation in Albania" *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* No.1930.

Evans, R.W., (2007) "Is openness inflationary? imperfect competition and monetary market power" *Working Paper No. 2007 (1)*, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.

Fanizza, D., and L., Söderling (2007) "Fiscal Determinants of Inflation: A Primer for the Middle East and North Africa *International Monetary Fund Working Paper,* WP/06/216. International Monetary Fund, Washington.

Gruben, W.C., and D., Mcleod (2004) "The openness–inflation puzzle revisited" *Applied Economics Letters* 11, 465-68.

Hamdi H and Sbia R, (2013), Dynamic Relationship between Oil Revenues, Government Spending and Economic Growth in an oil-dependent economy. *Economic Modelling* Vol pp 118–125

Hathroubi, S., and C. Aloui (2016) "On interactions between remittance outflows and Saudi Arabian macroeconomy: new evidence from wavelets" *Economic Modelling*, 59, 32-45.

Kandil, M. and H., Morsy (2011) "Determinants of inflation in GCC" *Middle East Development Journal* 3(2), 141–158.

Kim, M. and H., Beladi (2005) "Is free trade deflationary" *Economic Letters* 89, 343-49.

Kiviet, J.F., (1995) "On bias, inconsistency, and efficiency of various estimators in dynamic panel data models" *Journal of Econometrics* 68, 53-78.

Konan S Y and N'Zué F F (2020) "Should countries restrict remittances outflow? Evidence from Côte d'Ivoire. *Migration and Development"* (Forthcoming).

Lane, P.R., (1997) "Inflation in open economies" *Journal of International Economics* 42, 327-47.

Leo, B., (2007) "Money and Inflation in the Islamic Republic of Iran" *International Monetary Fund Working Paper,* WP/07/119. International Monetary Fund, Washington.

Musa, M., (1974) "Tariffs and the distribution of income" *Journal of Political Economy* 82, 191-1204.

Narayan, P.K., Narayan, S. and S., Mishra (2011) "Do Remittances Induce Inflation? Fresh Evidence from Developing Countries" *Southern Economic Journal* 77(4), 914-933.

Naufal, G. and I. Genc (2018) "Impact of Remittance Outflows on Sending Economies: The Case of the Russian Federation", *Asia-Pacific Population Journal*, 32(2), 61-85.

Reichert J. (1981) "The Migrant Syndrome: Seasonal U.S. Wage Labor and Rural Development in Central Mexico" *Human Organization* 40(1), 56-66.

Romer, D., (1993) "Openness and inflation: theory and evidence" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108, 869-903.

Temple, J., (1999) "The new growth evidence" *Journal of Economic Literature* 37(1), 112-156.

Termos, A., Naufal, G., I., Genc (2013) "Remittance outflows and inflation: The case of the GCC countries" *Economics Letters* 120, 45–47

Table 4. The Disaggregated LSDVC Estimations Results

	LSDVC Estimations Results (GCC)					LSDVC Estimations Results (non-GCC)				
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Inflation.L1	0.2877 (0.2998)	0.2263 (1.9363)	0.3226 (0.9991)	0.2363 (1.2148)	0.2242 (1.1425)	0.7879 *** (0.0608)	0.6640*** (0.0731)	.6681*** (0.0717)	0.6681*** (0.0717)	0.6681*** (0.0717)
GDP	-0.0117 (0.0451)	-0.0048 (0.4041)	-0.0173 0.1009	-0.0575 (0.1145)	-0.0476 (0.1892)	-0.5562*** (0.1951)	-0.5174** (0.2193)	-0.5159** (0.2202)	-0.5159** (0.2203)	- .5158942** .2202663
Remittances Outflows	-0.0164 (0.0109)	-0.0215 (0.0443)	-0.0211 0.0385	-0.0189 (0.0349)	-0.0189 (0.0464)	0.0072 (0.0273)	-0.0084 (0.0228)	-0.0078 (.0231)	-0.0078 (0.0231)	-.0077793 .0231181
Trade (% GDP)		0.0013 (0.6282)	0.0063 0.7970	-0.0227 (0.9070)	-0.0237 (0.4065)		0.1731* (0.1066)	0.1756* (0.1079)	0.1756* (0.1079)	0.1756* (0.1079)
Current Account deficit (% GDP)			0.0130 (0.1034)	0.0132 (0.1115)	0.0092 (0.0775)			0.1166 (0.3049)	0.1166 (0.3049)	0.1166 (0.3049)
Oil price				0.0006 (0.0049)	0.0006 (0.0039)				0.0027 (0.0025)	-0.0008 (0.0023)
Tbill					0.0005 (0.0311)					-0.0289*** (0.0105)