

The effect of exchange rate regimes on growth under financial development and trade openness*

Woubet Kassa[†]

Emmanuel K.K. Lartey[‡]

Abstract

This paper analyzes the dynamics of the relationship between exchange rate flexibility and economic growth as influenced by the level of financial development and the degree of trade openness. Using data for African countries, we find that an increase in exchange rate flexibility has a negative impact on both GDP growth and the growth of total factor productivity. This negative impact is, however, dampened as the level of financial development increases, and also, as the degree of trade openness increases. Moreover, we find a strong positive association between exchange rate flexibility and financial development. Thus, while a fixed exchange rate regime may be preferable where the financial system is underdeveloped, we assert that given the well-known positive effects of financial development on growth, policy makers would have to assume and manage some exchange rate risks in order to foster the development of the financial infrastructure in these economies.

JEL Classification: E44 F33 F43 O40 O42

Keywords: Exchange Rate Regimes, Economic Growth, Productivity, Financial Development, Trade Openness

*We are grateful to Souleymane Coulibaly, Fulbert Tchana Tchana and Albert Zeufack for very helpful comments. The views expressed in this paper are ours and do not necessarily represent views of the World Bank. We are responsible for all errors.

[†]The World Bank, 1818 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20433. Email: wkassa1@worldbank.org

[‡]The World Bank, 1818 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20433. Email: elartey@worldbank.org

1 Introduction

Evidence on the effect of exchange rate regimes on productivity and growth is copious. Yet, the findings have been mixed and seemingly inconsistent. The policy recommendations emanating from such studies are particularly important for countries that have adopted various stances on exchange rate policy along the flexibility spectrum. In developing economies, the choice of exchange rate regime can have a considerable impact on a number of macroeconomic variables including growth, inflation, global competitiveness, the trade balance and overall macroeconomic stability (Bailliu et al., 2003; Bleaney et al., 2007; Gervais et al., 2016; Calvo and Reinhart, 2002; Aghion et al., 2009; Edwards and Yeyati, 2005). Exchange rate regimes, thus, have significant implications for developing economies in terms of real economic performance whereas the link between exchange rate flexibility and economic growth is often found to be weaker for advanced economies (Levy-Yeyati and Sturzenegger, 2003).

The lack of consensus and consistency in the evidence, often considered an empirical challenge, is driven by a lack of clarity in the conceptual frameworks underlying the relationship between exchange rate regimes and various macroeconomic outcomes, mainly economic growth. Arguably, the relationship between exchange rate regime and economic growth would be influenced by salient characteristics of an economy. This study follows a strand of the literature that examines heterogeneity in the relationship between exchange rate regimes and growth through underlying macroeconomic fundamentals such as the degree of financial development (Slavtcheva, 2015; Aghion et al., 2009), financial openness and international financial integration (Rodriguez, 2016). In particular, we focus on identifying the heterogeneity that underlies the relationship between exchange rate regimes and economic growth in Africa across levels of financial development and degrees of trade openness.

In developing countries, the perennial debate on which type of exchange rate regime is favorable to economic growth is still ongoing. A major argument, among several, that has been advanced in favor of flexible exchange rate regimes is that they enhance economic growth by facilitating adjustments in an economy, particularly in response to unfavorable domestic and

foreign shocks in the presence of nominal rigidities. This, in effect, suggests that exchange rate pegs make an economy susceptible to greater macroeconomic volatility and should have adverse impact on growth. Furthermore, exchange rate pegs tend to culminate in overvaluation of currencies with potentially dire consequences for exports as well as capital flight and current account reversals, as was the case during the financial crises in Southeast Asia. On the contrary, an argument against flexible regimes is that they are a source of macroeconomic volatility, as they allow the transmission of negative external shocks, and hence dampen growth. Moreover, flexible regimes tend to be associated with uncertainty and potentially negative effects on trade, investment and economic performance in general. A fixed regime is, therefore, favored to provide an environment that enhances growth through a decline in risk and uncertainty associated with cross-border trade and investment.

The empirical evidence on the dynamics between exchange rate flexibility and growth in developing economies is mixed. On one hand, the findings from some studies suggest that there is no systematic relationship between exchange rate regimes and growth (Ghosh et al., 1997, 2002). On the other hand, other studies show contradictory evidence. For example Levy-Yeyati and Sturzenegger (2003) find that in developing economies, floating exchange rate regimes are associated with higher economic growth. In contrast, Husain et al. (2005) find that for emerging and developing economies, there is no growth benefit from a floating exchange rate regime but instead, countries seem to benefit from increasingly flexible exchange rate systems as they become richer and their financial systems develop. Using data for 10 major Asian economies, Coudert and Dubert (2005) also show that fixed regimes or pegs are associated with weaker growth than floating exchange rate regimes. On the contrary, Bleaney et al. (2007) indicate that some of the preceding results are not robust and find a negative correlation between flexible regimes and growth performance for a sample of 91 developing countries. Thus, the debate on the impact of exchange rate regimes on productivity and growth forges ahead.

It is arguable that the variation in findings across countries is not necessarily implausible. In fact, the existing literature has identified several channels through which exchange rate regimes could indirectly affect growth, such as investment, international trade, and the level of financial

development. [Bailliu et al. \(2003\)](#) find a positive relationship between a fixed regime and growth, a negative relationship between growth and an intermediate regime without an anchor, and no relationship between other regime types and economic growth; where the growth effects are based on the uncertainty or lack thereof created by the exchange rate regime, and the impact of that on trade and investment. [Aghion et al. \(2009\)](#) provide evidence to suggest that a flexible exchange rate regime is more favorable to growth in countries with more developed financial systems. They also observe a negative relationship between productivity growth and flexible regimes in countries with less developed financial systems. The main idea is that firms in countries with higher levels of financial development are able to survive liquidity shocks that accompany exchange rate fluctuations, and contribute to innovation and long-run growth. Such exchange rate volatility tends to have negative effects on long-run growth in less financially developed countries as they discourage investments.¹

There is hence an emerging understanding that the relationship between exchange rate flexibility and the growth of gross domestic product (GDP), or that between exchange rate flexibility and productivity, depends on some underlying characteristics of an economy. Existing studies with seemingly contradictory empirical results may have, potentially, failed to uncover the heterogeneity in these underlying characteristics. In this study, we attempt to identify some sources of heterogeneous impact of exchange rate flexibility on economic growth. Following the conceptual framework in [Aghion et al. \(2009\)](#), we examine the relationship between exchange rate regimes and economic growth in Africa across the distribution of levels of financial development. Not only does the focus on Africa represent a point of departure from [Aghion et al. \(2009\)](#), but we also contribute to the literature by analyzing the extent to which the relationship between exchange rate flexibility and growth varies by the degree of trade openness. The underlying hypothesis is that the benefits accruing to a country operating a flexible exchange rate should increase as it takes measures to facilitate trade.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the data and the

¹See [Aghion et al. \(2009\)](#) for a detailed discussion of the theoretical framework on how the effect of exchange rate flexibility on the productivity of credit constrained firms varies with the level of financial development

empirical strategy, and presents an exploratory analysis of the data with a focus on how productivity and economic growth relate to exchange rate regimes under varying levels of financial development and trade openness. The presentation and discussion of the results are given in sections 3 and 4 respectively, and concluding remarks are provided in section 5.

2 Empirical Analysis

2.1 Data

The sample for the study comprises 48 African countries.² The focus on Africa serves two purposes. First, it adds to the scanty evidence on the impact of exchange rate flexibility on growth in the region. In addition, similarities across African countries might be more amenable to research since uncertainties associated with unobserved heterogeneity will be minimal compared to studies that examine a set of countries that are at significantly different levels of development. The study employs a panel data that spans the period 1974-2015, and which has been transformed into non-overlapping five year averages. Averaging over five year periods has become a standard approach in analyzing longrun growth to filter out business cycle fluctuations and identify long term growth trends (Agenor and McDermott, 2000; Aguiar and Gopinath, 2007; Aghion et al., 2009).

Table 1: Summary Statistics


Variables (N=245)	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
GDP per capita growth	1.63	4.56	-8.27	49.7
Total factor productivity (TFP)	0.58	0.34	0.12	2.05
GDP per capita	1447.46	2062.42	124.35	14241.83
Exchange rate regime coarse class	2.01	1.19	1	6
Exchange rate regime fine class	6.24	4.25	1	15
Domestic credit to private sector (% of GDP)	21.16	21.36	0.97	150.97
Private credit (% GDP)	19.78	20.46	0.003	145.39
Education	34.36	22.47	2.64	104.46
Trade Openness (% of GDP)	75.53	35.94	13.59	211.57
Inflation (annual %)	15.8	37.08	-3.42	302.12
Government expenditure (% of GDP)	15.07	6.02	2.89	37.32
Bank crisis	0.08	0.2	0	1

The data for most of the variables are obtained from the World Development Indicators

²The list of countries is provided in the appendix. Unless a significant share of the data is missing, we include all 48 countries in the estimations.

and International Financial Statistics, whereas the data for exchange rate regimes comes from [Reinhart and Rogoff \(2004, 2009\)](#), [Levy-Yeyati and Sturzenegger \(2016\)](#) and [Ilizetzi et al. \(2017\)](#). Productivity measures are obtained from Penn World Tables Version 9.0 ([Feenstra et al., 2015](#)). [Table 1](#) presents some basic summary statistics for the variables.

Figure 1: Exchange Rate Regimes and Growth



[Figure 1](#) presents preliminary evidence which suggests that, on average, there seems to be a negative association between exchange rate flexibility and GDP per capita growth, as well as between exchange rate flexibility and productivity. The relationship between exchange rate flexibility and per capita growth, however, varies across different levels of financial development as depicted in [Figure 2](#). For countries in the upper quartile of the financial development distribution, the basic relationship between per capita growth and exchange rate regime appears to be positive, whereas it is negative for those in the lower quartile.³

³It is noteworthy that there is a significant variation in productivity and growth across countries operating a fixed exchange rate regime which potentially highlights differences in structural policies.

Figure 2: Exchange Rate Flexibility and Growth By Financial Development





Figure 3: Exchange Rate Flexibility and Growth By Trade Openness



Similarly, [Figure 3](#) shows that in countries with a higher degree of trade openness (in the top quartile) as represented by the level of trade flow (exports and imports) as a share of GDP, there appears to be a positive association between exchange rate flexibility and per capita growth. The relationship between exchange rate flexibility and growth, however, is negative in countries at very low levels of openness. This suggests that the benefits of operating flexible exchange rate in terms of the effect on growth increases with greater degree of trade openness. In other words, it may be less beneficial to operate a flexible exchange rate regime without addressing policies that limit trade. Still and all, the associations represented in the figures only capture binary relationships with no consideration of other critical factors that impact growth, which represents the focus of the analysis in the next section.

2.2 Methodology

In order to explore further, how financial development and trade openness affect the relationship between exchange rate flexibility and economic growth, we specify and estimate a dynamic model using the generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator proposed by [Arellano and Bond \(1991\)](#), [Arellano and Bover \(1995\)](#) and [Blundell and Bond \(1998\)](#), which is designed to deal with potential endogeneity in all explanatory variables, but which accounts, particularly, for endogeneity due to the introduction of lags of the dependent variable as covariates. In addition to possible joint endogeneity of all explanatory variables, it addresses potential biases due to country-fixed effects. The dynamic equation is represented by a model of the form,

$$y_{i,t} - y_{i,t-1} = (\alpha - 1)y_{i,t-1} + \phi'X_{it} + \beta'Z_{it} + \mu_t + \eta_i + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where y_{it} is output per worker or per capita income, X_{it} is a vector of key variables of interest including financial development, trade openness and interaction of these variables with exchange rate flexibility; Z_{it} is a vector of other explanatory variables, η_i is a country specific effect which is unobserved, μ_t is the period specific effect and ε_{it} is an error term. The dependent variable is either GDP per capita growth rate or the growth rate of total factor productivity, and the main explanatory variables include initial per capita income, exchange rate regime, financial development, trade openness, government spending, inflation and an interaction term of financial

development and exchange rate regimes as well as an interaction of trade openness and exchange rate regime. The first interaction term is introduced to analyze the extent to which the level of financial development of a country influences the effect of exchange rate flexibility on economic growth whereas the latter term captures the extent to which trade openness affects the impact of exchange rate regime on growth.⁴

Equation (1) is estimated using the system GMM estimator which combines an estimator in first-differences with an estimator in levels. The inclusion of a levels equation allows the use of information on cross-country differences. This estimation technique generates internal instruments by using the lagged levels and lagged differences of the explanatory variables as instruments under two conditions: i) that there is no serial correlation in the errors and ii) the differences of the explanatory variable and the errors are uncorrelated. Two specification tests, Sargan test for over-identifying restrictions and Arellano-Bond test for second-order serial correlation are applied to assess the validity of the instruments and consistency of the estimates.⁵ All estimates are based on the 2-step system GMM with Windmeijer's (2005) small sample correction.

3 Results

3.1 Interaction with financial development

Table 2 presents results that characterize the dynamics of the relationship between exchange rate regimes and the growth of GDP per capita, using the coarse classification for exchange rate regimes. Exchange rate flexibility has negative effect on growth, but the interaction variable which captures the impact of an increase in flexibility as level of financial development rises is positive. These results are robust to different indicators of financial development. The coefficient for the interaction term suggests that the effect of exchange rate flexibility on growth tends positive as the level of financial development increases. Moreover, the nonlinear combination of the standalone effect of exchange rate regimes and the interaction of financial development and exchange rate

⁴For all estimations, we use a logarithmic transformation of all variables, with the exception of the exchange rate regime index.

⁵See Blundell and Bond (1998) for details on the system GMM estimators. These estimators have been widely applied and discussed in a number of studies (Aghion et al., 2009; Rodriguez, 2016).

regime is negative and statistically significant, yet smaller in magnitude relative to the standalone effect of exchange rate flexibility on growth. Thus, at the average level of financial development, the negative effect of exchange rate flexibility is dampened.

There are a couple of noteworthy observations for some of the control variables. (i) The sign and statistical significance of trade openness suggests that policies that facilitate trade tend to foster growth in the region. (ii) The estimated negative impact of financial development on growth is contrary to what is typically observed in the literature. Nevertheless, such an outcome is possible under certain conditions. For example, the development of the banking sector could lead to lower savings, decrease investment and consequently, adversely impact growth due to financial repression or where financial liberalization is too fast and characterized by poor regulatory system (De Gregorio and Guidotti, 1995).

To further assess the dynamics of the relationship between economic growth and the interaction of exchange rate flexibility and financial development, the nonlinear combination of the coefficients for exchange rate regimes and the interaction term is estimated at different thresholds along the distribution of financial development. The estimates are based on results in Table 2, columns (2), (3), (5) and (6), and presented in Table 3. The estimated nonlinear effects show that the negative impact of exchange rate flexibility on growth declines at higher levels of financial development. For instance, the negative impact of exchange rate flexibility declines from -1.326 at the first quartile of financial development to -1.169 at the second quartile and to -0.953 at the third quartile. This suggests that the negative impact of flexible exchange rates declines at higher levels of financial development.

The specifications in Table 4 utilize the fine classification for exchange rate regimes in order to assess the robustness of the initial findings, and the estimates are in general, consistent with the results in Table 2, that an increase in the level of financial development mitigates the negative effect of flexible exchange rates on economic growth. Specifically, the coefficient for exchange rate regime is statistically significant and negative in all specifications, whereas the interaction variable is positive in each case.

Next, we follow to some degree, the analysis in [Aghion et al. \(2009\)](#) to address the impact of exchange rate variability on productivity growth. [Table 5](#) presents results for estimates based on specifications that introduce total factor productivity (TFP) growth as the dependent variable. The estimates indicate that an increase in exchange rate flexibility has a negative impact on productivity growth. Moreover, as observed in the previously estimated models, the nonlinear combination of the estimates for exchange rate regime and the interaction term involving exchange rate regime and financial development is negative and significant, but smaller in magnitude in comparison to the standalone effect of exchange rate flexibility.⁶ Thus the development of the financial sector of a country has a positive influence on the effect of exchange rate flexibility on productivity growth. This result is supported by the estimates of the nonlinear effects at different percentiles of financial development presented in [Table 8](#), the negative effect being dampened, for example, from -0.078 at the 25th percentile of the financial development index, to -0.016 at the 90th percentile.

3.2 Interaction with trade openness

We also examine the extent to which trade openness matters for the impact of exchange rate regimes in the region. The advantages of flexible exchange rates in terms of promoting exports is well-documented. We, therefore, hypothesize that the effect of an increase in exchange rate flexibility on growth should increase with a rise in the degree of trade openness. [Table 7](#) presents estimates for specifications that incorporate an interaction of trade openness and exchange rate flexibility. The estimates show that the standalone effect of exchange rate flexibility is negative and statistically significant across all specifications, whereas the interaction term for exchange rate regime and trade openness is positive. This suggests that trade openness dampens the negative effect of exchange rate flexibility on growth, as reflected by the estimates of the nonlinear combination of the standalone effect of exchange rate regime and the coefficient for the interaction variable at the mean level of trade openness, which turns out to be negative and smaller in magnitude in comparison to the standalone effect across all specifications.

⁶It should be noted that the sample size drops significantly due to unavailability of data for TFP for some countries. As noted in [Gadanecz and Mehrotra \(2013\)](#), it is a challenge to capture the longrun impact of exchange rate flexibility on total factor productivity in developing economies due to lack of data.

Furthermore, we estimate the variation in the effect of exchange rate flexibility on growth across various percentiles of the distribution of trade openness, using results from [Table 7](#). The estimates, as shown in [Table 8](#), show that the nonlinear effects are statistically significant, and suggest that the negative effect of exchange rate flexibility diminishes with an increase in trade openness.

4 Discussion

4.1 Financial development indicators

Arguably, the ideal financial development indicator should be one that incorporates access to financial services, particularly on account of the recent surge in mobile finance in some countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Even then, not only is data lacking on financial development indicators that incorporate usage of mobile financial infrastructure, which is relevant to aspects of depth and access in several countries ([Sahay et al., 2015](#)), but only an estimated 34% of the adult population in SSA have an account at a formal financial institution ([Demirguc-Kunt et al., 2015](#)). This suggests that the impact of the surge in mobile finance on domestic savings mobilization has not been significant.

Indeed, the advances in financial innovation via the use of mobile phones has had an impact on financial inclusion and access to financing for households. Within the context of the interaction between exchange rate flexibility and financial development, however, the emphasis is on firms' access to finance and not on financial inclusion per se. Moreover, [Sahay et al. \(2015\)](#) show that credit to firms tends to have a greater growth impact than credit to households, as credit to firms eliminates financing constraints leading to greater investment and growth. Thus, to the extent that over 90% of the private sector in SSA constitute SMEs, majority of which face financing constraints, it is arguable that formal financial institutions remain the main source of finance for SMEs in Africa, and hence the indicators utilized in the estimations can be considered as representative of the general state of financial development with respect to firms' access to finance.⁷

⁷[Kuntchev et al. \(2012\)](#) found that of the small businesses in sub-Saharan Africa that obtained external financing, 6.3% took the form of equity, 48.5% was formal external debt, 17.4% semi-formal financing and 27.8% informal financing.


Nevertheless, we perform additional robustness checks using recently created financial development index by [Sahay et al. \(2015\)](#) which incorporates measures for depth, access and efficiency of financial institutions and markets. It is noteworthy that this composite index suggests that financial development in sub-Saharan African has been mediocre over the past three decades, and that the financial system in Sub-Saharan Africa trails other regions, although there has been some modest improvement over the last 15 years (Montfort et al, 2016). The results, which are presented in the appendix ([Table A5](#)), show the interaction term for the exchange rate regime and financial development indexes bears a positive coefficient. Moreover, the effect of an increase in exchange rate flexibility estimated at the mean level of financial development is positive and statistically significant. These estimates substantiate the initial finding that an increase in financial development facilitates a positive impact of exchange rate flexibility on economic growth.

4.2 Exchange rate regimes and financial development

The choice of exchange rate regime tends to be endogenous to the level of financial development especially in economies with less developed financial sector. Thus, although the focus of this paper is on the interaction between the two variables and the impact on economic growth, we provide a brief assessment of how they may be related. Flexible exchange rates can be instrumental in minimizing incentives for foreign currency borrowing which helps to minimize currency mismatches, and deepen domestic financial markets particularly for local currency debt instruments and those for hedging against exchange rate risks [Gadanecz and Mehrotra \(2013\)](#). Thus, fixed exchange rate regimes may discourage the development of the financial system.

[Figure 4](#) presents a plot of the exchange rate regime index (fine classification) against a financial development index (private sector credit as a percentage of GDP) for fixed regime countries and flexible regime countries, which shows that on average, countries operating flexible regimes have relatively more developed financial systems than countries with a fixed regime. This suggests that fixed exchange rate regimes are associated with a lower level of financial development in general.

Figure 4: Financial development under fixed and flexible exchange rate regimes



We also estimate a simple fixed effects model to assess the extent of the relationship between exchange rate regimes and financial development, and find that there is a strong and positive association between the two variables. The regression model specifies financial development as dependent on exchange rate regimes, controlling for variables like inflation, GDP per capita and year fixed-effects. For variant specifications using private sector credit as the indicator for financial development, the coefficient estimate for exchange rate regimes varies between 1.43 and 2.12 and significant at 1% level ⁸. We further estimate another set of regressions using the financial development index compiled by [Sahay et al. \(2015\)](#), and find positive and statistically significant coefficients for exchange rate regime ranging between 0.61 and 1.53 as reported in the appendix ([Table A4](#)). While we do not infer the direction of causality, it is important to note that whether low financial development leads to the choice of fixed exchange rate regimes or it is the case that the absence of flexibility in the exchange rate may not be conducive to the deepening of the financial system, the estimates indicate there is a coexistence between higher level of financial development and more flexible exchange rate regimes.

⁸The results are available upon request.

5 Concluding Remarks

This paper examines the impact of exchange rate regimes, and hence exchange rate policy on growth in Africa. We study the dynamics of this relationship along two dimensions: (i) the level of financial development, and (ii) the degree of trade openness. The main results suggest that variability in the exchange rate has a negative effect on GDP growth as well as on the growth rate of total factor productivity. This negative effect, however, diminishes as the level of financial development increases. Thus, an improvement in the development of the financial system serves to lessen the negative effects of an increase in exchange rate flexibility. Moreover, the results indicate that an increase in openness to trade also dampens the negative impact of exchange rate variability on growth. In other words, an increase in trade openness enhances the potential benefits of flexible exchange rates on growth. Furthermore, we observe that there is a positive and strong association between exchange rate flexibility and financial development.

A fixed exchange rate regime insulates an economy with an underdeveloped financial system from the risks associated with exchange rate variability and its negative consequences on growth. Yet, studies have shown that there is a threshold of financial development beyond which countries inevitably enjoy the well-known positive effects of financial development on growth, even under exchange rate variability. Given that financial systems are generally underdeveloped across the continent, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, operating a flexible exchange rate regime implies exposure to some of the risks associated with variability in the exchange rate. It is likely the case, therefore, that the level of financial development may dictate the choice of exchange rate policy, such that countries with an underdeveloped financial system would opt for limited to no flexibility in their exchange rates. The inherent policy dilemma, hence, is that pegged exchange rates, in spite of minimizing exchange rate risks, may hinder the development of a country's financial system. Policy makers will have to decide how much of such risks they are able to assume and effectively manage as they pursue policies to develop their financial systems in order to reap the positive effects that come with a well-functioning financial architecture.

Furthermore, although the observed impact of financial development on the dynamics between

exchange rate flexibility and growth is consistent with [Aghion et al. \(2009\)](#), there is a notable difference. [Aghion et al. \(2009\)](#) show that for a sample that includes both developed and developing economies, there is a threshold level of financial development beyond which exchange rate flexibility has a positive effect on productivity growth. In this study, however, the estimated nonlinear effect at the 75th percentile of financial development for instance, is negative but of a significantly smaller magnitude in comparison to the standalone effect of exchange rate flexibility. This suggests that for African countries, the level of financial development as captured by traditional measures is quite low, such that even in countries with the highest level of financial development in the region, the best outcome for a further deepening of the financial system would be to neutralize the negative effect of exchange rate flexibility on growth. On the contrary, when financial development is measured using the indicator by [Sahay et al. \(2015\)](#), a positive impact of exchange rate flexibility is realized at the mean level of financial development for the countries in the sample. This, therefore, further underscores the need for policy makers to push the agenda on developing the financial sector in these countries, especially the development of financial markets, if some of the benefits of exchange rate flexibility are to be realized.

References

- Agenor, P.-R. and McDermott, C. J. (2000). Macroeconomic fluctuations in developing countries. *World Bank Economic Review*, 14(2):251–285.
- Aghion, P., Bacchetta, P., Ranciere, R., and Rogoff, K. (2009). Exchange rate volatility and productivity growth: The role of financial development. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 56(4):494–513.
- Aguiar, M. and Gopinath, G. (2007). Emerging market business cycles: The cycle is the trend. *Journal of political Economy*, 115(1):69–102.
- Arellano, M. and Bond, S. (1991). Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. *The review of economic studies*, 58(2):277–297.
- Arellano, M. and Bover, O. (1995). Another look at the instrumental variable estimation of error-components models. *Journal of econometrics*, 68(1):29–51.
- Bailliu, J., Lafrance, R., and Perrault, J.-F. (2003). Does exchange rate policy matter for growth? *International Finance*, 6(3):381–414.
- Bleaney, M., Francisco, M., et al. (2007). Exchange rate regimes, inflation and growth in developing countries-an assessment. *The BE Journal of Macroeconomics*, 7(1):1–18.
- Blundell, R. and Bond, S. (1998). Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of econometrics*, 87(1):115–143.
- Calvo, G. A. and Reinhart, C. M. (2002). Fear of floating. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(2):379–408.
- Coudert, V. and Dubert, M. (2005). Does exchange rate regime explain differences in economic results for asian countries? *Journal of Asian Economics*, 16(5):874–895.
- De Gregorio, J. and Guidotti, P. E. (1995). Financial development and economic growth. *World development*, 23(3):433–448.
- Demirguc-Kunt, A., Klapper, L. F., Singer, D., and Van Oudheusden, P. (2015). The global finindex database 2014: Measuring financial inclusion around the world.
- Edwards, S. and Yeyati, E. L. (2005). Flexible exchange rates as shock absorbers. *European Economic Review*, 49(8):2079–2105.
- Feenstra, R. C., Inklaar, R., and Timmer, M. P. (2015). The next generation of the penn world table. *The American Economic Review*, 105(10):3150–3182.
- Gadanecz, B. and Mehrotra, A. (2013). The exchange rate, real economy and financial markets. In *Market volatility and foreign exchange intervention in EMEs: what has changed?*, volume 73, pages 11–23. Bank for International Settlements.
- Gervais, O., Schembri, L., and Suchanek, L. (2016). Current account dynamics, real exchange rate adjustment, and the exchange rate regime in emerging-market economies. *Journal of Development Economics*, 119:86–99.
- Ghosh, A. R., Gulde, A.-M., Ostry, J. D., and Wolf, H. C. (1997). Does the nominal exchange rate regime matter? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Ghosh, A. R., Gulde-Wolf, A.-M., and Wolf, H. C. (2002). *Exchange rate regimes: choices and consequences*, volume 1. MIT press.
- Husain, A. M., Mody, A., and Rogoff, K. S. (2005). Exchange rate regime durability and performance in developing versus advanced economies. *Journal of monetary economics*, 52(1):35–64.

- Ilzetzki, E., Reinhart, C. M., and Rogoff, K. S. (2017). The country chronologies to exchange rate arrangements into the 21st century: Will the anchor currency hold? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kuntchev, V., Ramalho, R., Rodríguez-Meza, J., and Yang, J. S. (2012). What have we learned from the enterprise surveys regarding access to finance by smes? *Enterprise Analysis Unit of the Finance and Private Sector Development, The World Bank Group*.
- Levy-Yeyati, E. and Sturzenegger, F. (2003). To float or to fix: Evidence on the impact of exchange rate regimes on growth. *The American Economic Review*, 93(4):1173–1193.
- Levy-Yeyati, E. and Sturzenegger, F. (2016). Classifying exchange rate regimes: 15 years later. Technical report, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government.
- Mlachila, M., Cui, L., Jidoud, A., Newiak, M., Radzewicz-Bak, B., Takebe, M., Ye, Y., and Zhang, J. (2016). *Financial Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: Promoting Inclusive and Sustainable Growth*. International Monetary Fund.
- Reinhart, C. M. and Rogoff, K. S. (2004). The modern history of exchange rate arrangements: a reinterpretation. *the Quarterly Journal of economics*, 119(1):1–48.
- Reinhart, C. M. and Rogoff, K. S. (2009). *This time is different: Eight centuries of financial folly*. princeton university press.
- Rodriguez, C. M. (2016). The growth effects of financial openness and exchange rates. *International Review of Economics & Finance*.
- Sahay, R., Cihák, M., N'Diaye, P., and Barajas, A. (2015). Rethinking financial deepening: Stability and growth in emerging markets. *Revista de Economía Institucional*, 17(33):73–107.
- Slavtcheva, D. (2015). Financial development, exchange rate regimes and productivity growth: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 44:109–123.
- Windmeijer, F. (2005). A finite sample correction for the variance of linear efficient two-step gmm estimators. *Journal of econometrics*, 126(1):25–51.

Table 2: Effect of Exchange Rate Regimes: Role of Financial Development (I)

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Exchange Rate Regime (ERR)	-1.258** (0.033)	-1.536*** (0.002)	-1.572*** (0.000)	-1.636*** (0.002)	-1.017*** (0.005)	-1.857*** (0.000)
Financial Development (FD)	-0.909 (0.488)	-2.101 (0.127)	-1.533** (0.027)	-0.247 (0.247)	-0.523 (0.523)	-0.756 (0.756)
ERR*Financial Development		0.024** (0.016)	0.034* (0.055)		0.031** (0.027)	0.033** (0.017)
Initial GDP per capita	2.853 (0.470)	3.874 (0.200)	-3.212* (0.079)	-2.845 (0.316)	2.801 (0.254)	0.672 (0.691)
Education	-0.805 (0.330)	0.259 (0.769)	0.148 (0.808)	0.191 (0.812)	1.532** (0.041)	-0.003 (0.996)
Government Spending	-1.384 (0.577)	0.470 (0.865)	-3.759*** (0.000)	-3.312*** (0.007)	-4.130*** (0.001)	-4.618*** (0.000)
Trade Openness	7.594*** (0.000)	5.528*** (0.002)	6.281*** (0.000)	6.109*** (0.001)	5.967*** (0.000)	9.616*** (0.000)
Inflation	-2.605*** (0.001)	-1.278** (0.033)	-1.336* (0.065)	-0.701 (0.220)	-1.728*** (0.001)	-2.004*** (0.008)
Bank Crisis			-0.151 (0.852)			0.750 (0.396)
$[ERR + ERR * FD]^1$		-1.055** (0.014)	-0.888*** (0.000)		-0.434 (0.254)	-1.598*** (0.000)
Observations	245	245	245	244	244	244
No. of countries	48	48	48	48	48	48
Hansen Test	(0.665)	(0.917)	(0.716)	(0.570)	(0.746)	(0.749)
Sargan Test	(0.259)	(0.980)	(0.268)	(0.160)	0.150	(0.372)
AR(2) Test	(0.116)	(0.176)	(0.104)	(0.112)	(0.128)	(0.108)

Notes: Dependent variable is GDP per capita growth rate; p-values are in paranthesis; *** significant at 1%, ** at 5% * at 10% levels. ERR is Exchange Rate Regime. FD is financial development. ERR is based on Reinhart and Roggoff coarse classification. (1)-(3) use credit to private sector (% GDP) while (4)-(6) use total credit (% GDP) as a measure of financial development. ¹ $[ERR + ERR * FD]$ represents the non-linear effect of ERR at the mean of financial development index. Estimates are based on a 2-step system GMM with Windmeijer (2005) small sample correction.

Table 3: Non-linear effects of ERR at various percentiles of financial development

	p25	p50	p75	p90
Table 2 (2)	-1.326** (0.003)	-1.169** (0.007)	-0.953** (0.026)	-0.559 (0.224)
Table 2 (3)	-1.273*** (0.000)	-1.051*** (0.000)	-0.742*** (0.000)	-0.182 (0.673)
Table 2 (5)	-0.773** (0.023)	-0.571* (0.100)	-0.328 (0.418)	-0.236 (0.683)
Table 2 (6)	-1.598*** (0.000)	-1.385*** (0.000)	-1.127*** (0.001)	-0.531 (0.201)

Notes: p-values are in parenthesis; *** significant at 1%, ** at 5%, * at 10% levels. ERR is Exchange Rate Regime. Non-linear estimates are based on interaction of ERR*Financial Development from Table 2. p25, p50, p75 and p90 are percentiles of financial development index at 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th percentile, respectively.

Table 4: Effect of Exchange Rate Regimes: Role of Financial Development (II)

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Exchange Rate Regime	-0.683*** (0.000)	-0.352* (0.091)	-0.571*** (0.000)	-0.470*** (0.008)	-1.165*** (0.000)	-1.088*** (0.000)
Financial Development	-1.161 (0.231)	-1.420 (0.323)	-0.822 (0.299)	-0.261 (0.650)	-0.574 (0.204)	-0.461 (0.201)
ERR*Financial Development		0.006** (0.037)	0.009* (0.076)		0.005** (0.029)	0.002 (0.304)
Initial GDP per capita	0.881 (0.775)	2.237 (0.556)	-0.844 (0.664)	-3.848 (0.185)	-0.889 (0.606)	-2.661 (0.162)
Education	0.410 (0.533)	0.362 (0.680)	0.472 (0.445)	0.188 (0.823)	1.572*** (0.002)	0.594 (0.367)
Government Spending	-0.337 (0.830)	-0.280 (0.925)	-3.252** (0.014)	-2.599** (0.033)	-0.629 (0.471)	-1.167 (0.221)
Trade Openness	5.207*** (0.000)	5.662*** (0.002)	7.676*** (0.000)	4.316** (0.012)	6.224*** (0.000)	5.933*** (0.000)
Inflation	-1.573** (0.014)	-1.340* (0.058)	-2.216*** (0.001)	-0.807 (0.194)	-0.141 (0.772)	-0.631* (0.069)
Bank Crisis			0.897 (0.295)			-0.220 (0.747)
$[ERR + ERR * FD]^1$		-0.203 (0.194)	-0.283** (0.012)		-1.131*** (0.000)	-1.086*** (0.000)
Observations	245	245	245	244	244	244
Number of Countries	48	48	48	48	48	48
Hansen Test	(0.363)	(0.870)	(0.619)	(0.691)	(0.419)	(0.643)
Sargan Test	(0.263)	(0.951)	(0.116)	(0.230)	(0.423)	(0.546)
AR(2) Test	(0.191)	(0.180)	(0.109)	(0.127)	(0.253)	(0.115)

Notes: Dependent variable is GDP per capita growth rate; p-values are in paranthesis; *** significant at 1%, ** at 5%, * at 10% levels. ERR is Exchange Rate Regime. FD is financial development. ERR is based on Reinhart and Roggoff fine classification. (1)-(3) use credit to private sector (% GDP) while (4)-(6) use total credit (% GDP) as a measure of financial development. ¹ $[ERR + ERR * FD]$ represents the non-linear effect of ERR at the mean of financial development index. Estimates are based on a 2-step system GMM with Windmeijer (2005) small sample correction.

Table 5: Effect of Exchange Rate Regimes: Role of Financial Development(III)

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)
Exchange Rate Regime	-0.035*** (0.004)	-0.098** (0.030)	-0.088* (0.075)
Financial Development	-0.017 (0.298)	-0.120 (0.100)	-0.077 (0.124)
ERR*Financial Development		0.002 (0.296)	0.003 (0.205)
Initial TFP	0.073** (0.040)	0.158* (0.085)	0.095** (0.015)
Education	-0.034 (0.173)	0.078 (0.373)	0.004 (0.919)
Government Spending	-0.023 (0.449)	-0.142 (0.139)	0.028 (0.400)
Trade Openness	0.081** (0.028)	0.024 (0.778)	0.088** (0.012)
Inflation	0.002 (0.968)	-0.035 (0.856)	-0.253** (0.011)
Bank Crisis			-0.001 (0.973)
$[ERR + ERR * FD]^1$		-0.057*** (0.007)	-0.035* (0.087)
Observations	142	142	142
Number of ccode	26	26	26
Hansen Test	(0.689)	(0.243)	(0.644)
Sargan Test	(0.371)	(0.570)	(0.501)
AR(2) Test	(0.468)	(0.163)	(0.979)

Notes: Dependent variable is growth rate of of TFP; p-values are in paranthesis; *** significant at 1% level, ** at 5% level, * at 10% level. ERR is Exchange Rate Regime. FD is financial development. ERR is based on Reinhart and Roggoff coarse classification. Financial development is measured by credit to private sector (% GDP). ¹ $[ERR + ERR * FD]$ represents the non-linear effect of ERR at the mean of financial development index. Estimates are based on a 2-step system GMM with Windmeijer (2005) small sample correction.

Table 6: Non-linear effects of ERR at various percentiles of financial development

	p25	p50	p75	p90
Table 5 (2)	-0.078*** (.005)	-0.064*** (.002)	-0.043* (.082)	-0.016 (.718)
Table 5 (3)	-0.063** (.043)	0-.045** (.045)	-0.019 (.411)	0.015 (.707)

Notes: p-values are in parenthesis; *** significant at 1% level, ** at 5% level, * at 10% level. Non-linear estimates are based on interaction of ERR*Financial Development from Table 5. p25, p50, p75 and p90 are percentiles of financial development index at 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th percentile, respectively.

Table 7: Effects of Exchange Rate Regimes: Role of Trade Openness

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Exchange Rate Regime	-1.966*** (0.002)	-2.106*** (0.000)	-2.116*** (0.000)	-1.794*** (0.001)
Financial Development	-1.219 (0.143)	-2.168*** (0.000)	-1.010*** (0.005)	-0.473 (0.204)
ERR*Trade Openness	0.011** (0.030)	0.012** (0.020)	0.007* (0.086)	0.007 (0.179)
Initial GDP per capita	4.018 (0.147)	1.915 (0.323)	1.453 (0.238)	-0.387 (0.805)
Education	-0.150 (0.831)	0.353 (0.502)	0.367 (0.575)	0.235 (0.609)
Government Spending	-2.581** (0.044)	-0.951 (0.382)	-2.235*** (0.002)	-0.631 (0.518)
Trade Openness	5.415*** (0.000)	3.952*** (0.001)	6.214*** (0.000)	4.819*** (0.001)
Inflation	-2.207*** (0.004)	-1.317** (0.015)	-1.309*** (0.000)	-0.010 (0.991)
Bank Crisis		-1.946* (0.051)		-2.978*** (0.000)
$[ERR + Openness * ERR]^1$	-1.177** (0.003)	-1.256*** (0.000)	-1.617*** (0.000)	-1.301*** (0.000)
Observations	245	245	245	245
Number of countries	48	48	48	48
Hansen Test	(0.632)	(0.576)	(0.780)	(0.865)
Sargan Test	(0.215)	(0.233)	(0.192)	(0.144)
AR(2) Test	(0.101)	(0.0986)	(0.121)	(0.119)

Notes: Dependent variable is growth rate of GDP per capita; p-values are in paranthesis; *** significant at 1%, ** at 5%, * at 10% levels. ERR is Exchange Rate Regime. ERR is based on Reinhart and Roggoff coarse classification.(1)-(2) use credit to private sector (% GDP) while (3)-(4) use total credit (% GDP) as a measure of financial development. ¹ $[ERR + Openness * ERR]$ represents the non-linear effect of ERR at the mean of trade openness index. Estimates are based on a 2-step system GMM with Windmeijer (2005) small sample correction.

Table 8: Non-linear effects of ERR at various percentiles of trade openness

	p25	p50	p75	p90
Table 7 (1)	-1.443*** (0.001)	-1.273** (0.002)	-0.963** (0.012)	-0.622 (0.134)
Table 7 (2)	-1.543*** (0.000)	-1.360 (0.000)	-1.026*** (0.000)	-0.659* (0.056)
Table 7 (3)	-1.785*** (0.000)	-1.678*** (0.000)	-1.483*** (0.000)	-1.267*** (0.000)
Table 7 (4)	-1.468*** (0.000)	-1.362*** (0.000)	-1.168*** (0.000)	-.955*** (0.000)

Notes: p-values are in parenthesis; *** significant at 1% level, ** at 5% level, * at 10% level. ERR is Exchange Rate Regime. Estimates are based on interaction of ERR*Trade Openness from Table 7. p25, p50, p75 and p90 are percentiles of trade openness at 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th percentile, respectively.

Appendix

Figure A-1: Countries per exchange rate regime - Reinhart-Rogoff coarse classification (Table A3)




Table A1: Reinhart & Rogoff Coarse De Facto Exchange Rate Classification

Regime Class	Description
1	No separate legal tender
1	Pre announced peg or currency board arrangement
1	Pre announced horizontal band that is narrower than or equal to $\pm 2\%$
1	De facto peg
2	Pre announced crawling peg
2	Pre announced crawling band that is narrower than or equal to $\pm 2\%$
2	De facto crawling peg
2	De facto crawling band that is narrower than or equal to $\pm 2\%$
3	Pre announced crawling band that is wider than or equal to $\pm 2\%$
3	De facto crawling band that is narrower than or equal to $\pm 5\%$ (i.e., allows for both appreciation and depreciation overtime)
3	Moving band that is narrower than or equal to $\pm 2\%$
3	Managed floating
4	Freely floating
5	Freely falling
6	Dual market in which parallel market data is missing

Source: www.reinhartandrogoff.com

Table A2: Definitions and Data Sources

Variables	Definition	Source
GDP per capita growth	Growth rate of real GDP per capita	WDI ¹
Growth rate of TFP	Growth rate of total factor productivity	PWT ²
TFP at current PPPs	Total factor productivity at current PPP	PWT
GDP per capita	GDP per capita	WDI
Exchange rate regime-coarse	Reinhart and Rogoff de-facto exchange rate regime, coarse classification	RR ³
Exchange rate regime-fine	Reinhart and Rogoff de-facto exchange rate regime, fine classification	RR
Credit to private sector	Domestic credit to private sector (% of GDP)	WDI
Credit by banks & institutions	Private credit by deposit money banks and other financial institutions (% of GDP)	WDI
Education	Secondary enrollment ratio	WDI
Trade (Openness)	Total imports and exports (% of GDP)	WDI
Inflation (annual %)	log(100+inflation rate)	WDI
Government Expenditure	Total government expenditure (% of GDP)	WDI
Bank Crisis	= 1 if there was a crisis in that year, 0 otherwise	WDI

¹WDI - World Development Indicators; ²PWT - Penn World Tables from (Feenstra et al., 2015); ³RR - Reinhart and Rogoff's exchange rate regimes index Reinhart and Rogoff (2004, 2009) and Ilzetki et al. (2017)

Table A3: List of countries

Algeria	Congo (Rep. of)	Lesotho	Nigeria
Angola	Cote d'Ivoire	Liberia	Rwanda
Benin	Djibouti	Libya	Senegal
Botswana	Egypt	Madagascar	Sierra Leone
Burkina Faso	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi	South Africa
Burundi	Ethiopia	Mali	Swaziland
Cabo Verde	Gabon	Mauritania	Tanzania
Cameroon	Gambia, The	Mauritius	Togo
Central African Republic	Ghana	Morocco	Tunisia
Chad	Guinea	Mozambique	Uganda
Comoros	Guinea-Bissau	Namibia	Zambia
Congo (DR)	Kenya	Niger	Zimbabwe

Table A4: Exchange rate regime and growth (composite FD index)

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)
Exchange Rate Regime	-1.531*** (0.000)	-1.252*** (0.001)
Financial Development	-3.720*** (0.000)	-5.532*** (0.000)
ERR*Financial Development	0.146*** (0.000)	0.157*** (0.000)
Initial GDP per capita	-0.948*** (0.004)	1.332** (0.042)
Education	6.701*** (0.000)	6.750*** (0.000)
Government Spending	-1.925*** (0.000)	-1.080** (0.011)
Trade Openness	5.987*** (0.000)	3.658*** (0.001)
Inflation	-3.468** (0.016)	-5.631*** (0.000)
Bank Crisis		-5.656*** (0.003)
$[ERR + ERR * FD]^1$	0.319 (0.351)	0.740** (0.036)
Observations	215	215
Number of countries	46	46
Hansen Test	0.836	0.656
Sargan Test	0.000	0.000
AR(2)	0.128	0.388

FD is the [Sahay et al. \(2015\)](#) financial development index; ERR is based on coarse classification; p-values in parenthesis *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10

Table A5: Exchange rate regime and financial development

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Exchange Rate Regime	0.614* (0.087)	0.785** (0.026)	1.534*** (0.000)	1.407*** (0.001)	1.193*** (0.005)
GDP per capita	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Inflation			Yes	Yes	Yes
Trade Openness					Yes
Year FE		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Institutional quality				Yes	Yes
Constant	-11.17 (0.000)	-10.36 (0.000)	59.13*** (0.002)	56.96*** (0.003)	51.83*** (0.006)
Observations	298	298	276	276	275
R-squared	0.217	0.282	0.316	0.327	0.343

Dependent variable is [Sahay et al. \(2015\)](#) financial development index; ERR is based on coarse classification; institutional quality indicator is index of legal structure and security of property rights from the Quality of Government database.