Income convergence of divergence? Study on selected Muslim countries

Duasa, Jarita

2008

INCOME CONVERGENCE OR DIVERGENCE? STUDY ON SELECTED MUSLIM COUNTRIES

Jarita Duasa

Abstract

In this paper, the existence of income convergence or income divergence is investigated on ten selected OIC (the Organisation of Islamic Conference) economies. The results are then linked to the degree of openness of the countries using globalization indices. In order to investigate the existence of either income convergence or divergence between selected Islamic countries, income differentials between selected OIC countries and the benchmark country are computed and a series of test is done. The tests include stationary linearity test using Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test for linear time-series and non-linear stationary test using Kapetanois et al. (KSS) tests for non-linear time series. The findings are that most of the countries experience income divergence except for three countries. By analyzing the degree of globalization in these economies, it is found that the results support the endogeneous theory and depending approach which predict that globalization is likely to cause income divergence (inequality) rather than convergence (equality)

1. Introduction

It is hypothesized that despite the difference in initial income of countries/economies, poorer and richer economies may eventually converge in term of economic growth. This refers to income convergence. In specific, income convergence refers to the narrowing of income differential among poor and richer economies.

The issue of income convergence has drawn the attention of many empirical researchers and policy-makers. Most of the studies on this issue were done on developed and developing economies, such as among Western European economies by Salimano (2001) and on East Asian economies by Liew and Lim (2005) and Liew and Ahmad (2006). However, very few study is done extensively on Muslims economies in particular the member of the OIC (the Organisation of Islamic Conference). In regard to approach used in testing the convergence hypothesis, among many, are Coulombe and Trembly (2000), Afxentiou and Apostolos (1998), Coulombe and Lee (1998), Hofer and Worgotter (1997), Petrakos and Saratsis(2000) and Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1992).

The validity of this hypothesis could also be tested using stationary test of time series of income differential between poorer and richer countries. If there is evidence of stationarity (stable long-run movement) between two countries' incomes, this implies

income convergence over time. Otherwise, the result would be interpreted as income divergence. One commonly employed stationary test is the augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test (Dickey and Fuller, 1979). The empirical evidence based on the ADF test in most studies is generally in favour of income divergence. Some authors, including Li and Papell (1999), however, demonstrated that the ADF test is biased towards the non-rejection of stationary and therefore producing results that favour income divergence. In fact, in their study on the OECD economies, Li and Papell(1999), among others, able to provide more evidence of convergence after taking into consideration the structural breaks in their proposed stationary tests. Nonetheless, studies by Liew and Lim (2005) and Liew and Ahmad (2006) took a step further by looking the issue of convergence from non-linear point of view. Motivated by the findings of Liew et al. (2003) who argue that linear testing procedure may fail in non-linear context, Liew and Lim (2005) and Liew and Ahmad (2006) show empirically that non-linear stationary tests of Kapetonis et al. (2003) perform better than ADF in detecting stationarity in the presence of non-linearity.

Based on the fact that less study is done on Muslim developing countries especially by using non-linear stationary test, this study aims to investigate the existence of income convergence or divergence of selected Muslim countries (members of the OIC) using this latest method of non-linear test of stationary to produce robust results. Furthermore, motivated by mixed arguments on the relationship between income convergence/divergence and globalization in literature, the study attempts to relate the existence of convergence/divergence in these economies to openness of the economies (globalization). It is expected that the analysis on this relationship will, more or less, assist in setting up policy recommendation in these economies on reducing income gap and help to answer a question whether globalization policy is a better way to reduce the gap.

This study is organized as follows. Following the introduction in section 1, Section 2 reviews data and empirical work. Section 3 presents the empirical results. Section 4 attempts to relate the convergence/divergence of income of the countries in study to globalization and Section 5 concludes.

2. Data and empirical work

Sample period of this study covers 1970 to 2004 on 10 selected OIC members namely, Burkina Faso, Benin, Egypt, Malaysia, Oman, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Iran, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia. Based on previous practice, income variable is proxy by real per capita gross domestic product, denominated in common currency. Data on GDP is obtained from *International Financial Statistics* and the data are computed in common currency of US dollar by the author. The study examines the income convergence hypothesis in the context of US and the rest of selected OIC economies in the non-linear perspectives.

The first empirical investigation on income convergence is done by conducting a formal linearity test of Luukkonen *et al.* (1988) (LST). If the results of this test suggest the presence of non-linearity, then the Kapetanois *et al.* (2003) (KSS) of non-linear test of stationarity is applied. Otherwise, the ADF linear test of stationarity is used. However,

for results comparison purposes, the ADF test is also done side by side with KSS test for each data of income differentials.

The LST linearity test is adopted to determine whether the logarithm differences of real per capita GDP between two sample countries, $(\ln Y_{it} - \ln Y_{At})$ exhibits linear or non-linear behaviour. The test is specified as:

$$(\ln Y_{it} - \ln Y_{At}) = \alpha_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \alpha_k (\ln Y_{it-k} - \ln Y_{At-k}) + \sum_{k=1}^{p} [\beta_{1k} (\ln Y_{it-k} - \ln Y_{At-k})(\ln Y_{it-d} - \ln Y_{At-d}) +$$

$$\beta_{2i} (\ln Y_{it-k} - \ln Y_{At-k})(\ln Y_{it-d} - \ln Y_{At-d})^2 + \beta_{3i} (\ln Y_{it-k} - \ln Y_{At-k})(\ln Y_{it-d} - \ln Y_{At-d})^3 + v_t$$

$$(1)$$

where Y_{it} is the GDP of individual country under investigation and Y_{At} is the GDP of the US and v_t is white noise residuals with zero mean and constant variance assumption. Practically, the null hypothesis to be tested is that

$$H_0 : \text{all } \beta \text{'s} = 0 \qquad (2)$$

against the alternative that at least one β is non-zero. If the null hypothesis is not rejected, it implies the absence of non-linearity. Otherwise, the rejection of null hypothesis means the existence of a type of non-linearity in favour of the Smooth Transition Autoregressive ,STAR(p), model . The F-type test statistics is employed for this test of non-linearity. The optimal lag length, p, and the delay parameter, d, have to be determined in advance. Following Taylor and Peel (2000), the optimal p is fixed based on partial autocorrelation functions (PACF). The linearity test is performed for a class of d ranges from 1 to 12. The optimal d is chosen from the one that minimizes the p-value of the F-test statistic. Results of this test are presented in Table 1.

In testing the convergence or divergence of income, the KSS non-linear stationary test is then conducted to detect the presence of non-stationarity against non-linear. The stationary STAR process can be specified as:

$$\Delta(\ln Y_{it} - \ln Y_{At}) = \delta(\ln Y_{it-1} - \ln Y_{At-1})^3 + \mu_t \qquad (3)$$

or

$$\Delta(\ln Y_{it} - \ln Y_{At}) = \sum_{k=1}^{p} \beta \Delta(\ln Y_{it-k} - \ln Y_{At-k}) + \delta(\ln Y_{it-1} - \ln Y_{At-1})^3 + \omega_t \qquad (4)$$

where μ_t and ω_t are stochastic error terms each with zero mean and constant variance assumption. Equation (3) and (4) correspond to the conventional Dickey-Fuller (DF) and augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) stationary tests with no intercept and trend terms in non-linear framework. The divergence or convergence could be tested on δ using the t-statistics with the null hypothesis of $H_0 : \delta = 0$ (divergence) against the alternative of $H_1 : \delta > 0$ (convergence). The results of t-statistics estimated from equations (3) and (4) are reported in Table 2 as t_{KSS1} and t_{KSS2}. As suggested in Kapetonis *et al.* (2003), test of equation (4) is done for $1 \le p \le 12$ repeatedly and t_{KSS2} will only report the maximum test

statistics (or the minimum p-value of t-statistic). All these KSS test statistics are to be compared with the same set of critical values simulated by Liew and Lim (2005). This is because the conventional t critical values are no more applicable in this non-linear framework due to the asymptotically distribution of δ which has been proven non-normal. As mentioned earlier, ADF test results will also reported together with the KSS test for results comparison

3. Empirical Results

Results of LST Linearity test, from Table 1, have shown that income differentials between the US and all selected 10 economies, except for Burkina Faso, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia, cannot be taken as linear in nature. The inferences are made as the null hypothesis of the absence of non-linearity in most cases has been rejected by the F-statistics at less than 1% or 5% significance level. This finding suggests that the conventional ADF linear stationary test, which does not capture non-linearity in the data, is inappropriate to be employed in examining the issue of income convergence between the US and countries of Benin, Egypt, Malaysia, Oman, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Iran (7 economies). Thus, the KSS test should be used instead. As for Burkina Faso, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia, the conduct of ADF test is remained to be done since income differentials which involve these economies are linear in nature.

Table 1: Results of LST Linearity Test

Country	p	d	F	msv	$Q_{Ljung\text{-}Box}$ (msv)
Burkina Faso	1	2	0.698	0.506	0.902
Benin	1	11	10.836	0.000	0.045
Egypt	1	1	10.846	0.000	0.537
Malaysia	1	12	5.997	0.005	0.730
Oman	1	12	9.417	0.001	0.150
Bangladesh	1	6	18.185	0.000	0.675
Indonesia	1	12	3.191	0.049	0.879
Iran	1	12	5.393	0.007	0.515
Nigeria	1	1	2.051	0.129	0.599
Saudi Arabia	2	12	1.409	0.277	0.982

Notes: The optimal autoregressive lag length p is determined by inspecting the PACF of the series. The optimal delay parameter d is chosen from the one that minimizes the marginal significance value *(msv)* of the F test statistic. Ljung-Box portmanteau Q statistic is applied to test the presence of serial correlation up to 16 lags. Its *msv* is given in the last column.

Table 2 reports the results of stationary test for all countries using ADF test (for linear data) and both ADF and KSS tests (for non-linear data). The t_{KSS1} test statistics, based on equation (3), have shown that the null-hypothesis of non-stationary (divergence) cannot be rejected in most cases, except for Bangladesh. As for t_{KSS2} test statistics, based on equation (4), the evidence of convergence is found in the case of Benin. Nevertheless, the

Portmanteau Q statistics suggest that these KSS test statistics are not having a problem of serial correlation in its residuals. In comparison, these findings are in contrast to the results of the ADF test which suggest that all these 7 economies actually diverge with the US in terms of income.

In the case of Burkina Faso, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia, results of the ADF test suggest that income convergence is only be found for Burkina Faso, but not for Nigeria and Saudi Arabia.

Table 2: Results of Stationary Test

Country	Linear test	Non-Linear (KSS) tests			
	$ADF(p)$	t_{KSS1}	$Q_{Ljung\text{-}Box}$ (msv)	t_{KSS2}	$Q_{Ljung\text{-}Box}$ (msv)
Burkina Faso	-3.679(7)**	-	-	-	-
Benin	-2.951(1)	0.908	0.770	3.007(10)**	0.872
Egypt	-2.440(1)	2.232	0.115	1.531(8)	0.872
Malaysia	-3.088(5)	-1.117	0.839	-0.942(1)	0.979
Oman	-3.074(7)	-1.735	0.443	-1.697(3)	0.202
Bangladesh	-1.482(5)	3.397**	0.871	2.414(2)	0.793
Indonesia	-2.841(1)	1.031	0.985	2.179(7)	0.999
Iran	-2.095(1)	1.077	0.935	2.228(7)	0.948
Nigeria	-2.923(6)	-	-	-	-
Saudi Arabia	-2.622(1)	-	-	-	-

Notes: 1. In the t_{KSS2}, p is chosen from the one that maximizes the test statistics. For KSS test, the corresponding critical values are -2.66, -2.93 and -3.48 at 10%, 5% and 1% significance levels.
2. For the ADF test, p is automatically determined by computer programme based on the Minimum Akaike Information Criterion (AIC).
3. Ljung-Box portmanteau Q statistic is applied to test the presence of serial correlation up to 16 lags. Its marginal significance value (msv) is given for each t_{KSS}
4. *** denotes significant at 1% level, ** denotes significant at 5% level and * denotes significant at 10% level.

In summation, using linear and non-linear stationary tests (ADF and KSS tests), Three countries, Burkina Faso, Benin and Bangladesh, are found exhibit convergence behaviour with respect to the US's income, whereas the rest of countries in study, namely, Egypt, Malaysia, Oman, Indonesia, Iran, Nigeria and Saudi Arabia show otherwise.

4. Income convergence/divergence and globalization

The process of globalization is not occur just recently. It has its roots in the second half of the eighteenth century. In O'Rourke (2001), O'Rourke and Williamson (2000) and Maddison (2001) and Williamson (2002), the period of 1870-2000 is classified into the first wave of globalization 1870-1913, the de-globalization period of 1913-1950, the golden age of 1950-1973 and the second wave of globalization of 1973 onwards.

The relation to world inequality, there are 3 main approaches distinguished by Wade (2001) on relationship of globalization and income inequality (divergence) or equality (convergence). Neoclassical growth theory predicts that national economies will converge in their average incomes and average productivity levels because of increased mobility of capital. However, the endogenous growth theory predicts less convergence or divergence as diminishing returns to capital is offset by increasing returns to technological innovation in the developed countries. The third approach is the dependency approach which predicts that convergence is less likely and divergence more likely, because of differential benefits from economic integration and trade, restricted free market relations and locked developing countries to produce certain commodities.

The empirical evidence shows that convergence in per capita income did occur during the first wave of globalization due to an increase in international trade and massive international migration. However, the trend was not repeated in the second wave of globalization. Cornia and Court (2001) in a policy brief using the WIID database reports that inequality has risen since the early-mid 1980s. The non-traditional new causes of inequality identified are liberal economic policy regimes and the way in which economic reform policies have been carried out. Given the fact that rising inequality (divergence) threatens growth and poverty reduction, a study by Agenor (2003) has found the evidence of an inverted U-shape relationship between globalization and poverty in developing countries, indicating that at low (higher) levels tends to increase (reduce) poverty.

Table 3: 2003 Global Index (GI) Ranking (selected countries)

Rank	2003 GI	Rank	Economic	Rank	Technological	Rank	Personal	Rank	Political
18	Malaysia	8	Malaysia	26	Malaysia	14	Malaysia	27	Nigeria
37	Nigeria	22	Nigeria	43	S.Arabia	24	S.Arabia	35	Bangladesh
41	S.Arabia	47	Indonesia	48	Iran	43	Bangladesh	46	Malaysia
48	Egypt	49	S.Arabia	51	Indonesia	47	Egypt	49	Egypt
55	Bangladesh	58	Egypt	53	Egypt	52	Nigeria	53	Indonesia
59	Indonesia	59	Iran	61	Nigeria	61	Indonesia	59	S.Arabia
62	Iran	62	Bangladesh	62	Bangladesh	62	Iran	61	Iran

Notes: Burkina Faso, Benin and Oman are not included in the list of 2003 GI Rankings by A.T. Kearney()

As for the 10 selected economies in this study, their evidence of income convergence/divergence is somehow related to their level of globalization. Using Globalization Index (GI) created by A.T. Kearney/Foreign Policy Magazine (2002, 2003), 7 countries in this study are ranked based on the 2003 GI Rankings. The rankings are displayed on Table 3 for only 7 countries as the other 3 countries (Burkina Faso, Benin and Oman) are not listed within 62 countries observed by Kearney.

The data used in the computation of the GI consists of a number of variables on economic integration, personal contacts, technology, political engagement and supplement data. These are expected to proxy the channels through which globalization affects world inequality, in particular, the dynamic convergence in per capita income growth towards the steady state[1].

---

[1] See detail in Heshmati (2003) for sub-components of these variables.

It is shown on Table 3 that Bangladesh, who has proven to experience income convergence in this study, has lower ranking in the degree of globalization. Four countries (Malaysia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia and Egypt) which proven to have income divergence, on the other hand, are among the countries who are highly ranked in the level of globalization. To be specific, high degree of globalization economically (refer to column 3 and 4 of Table 3) and technologically (refer to column 5 and 6 of similar table) are the causes of income divergence in the countries in study. Among seven countries, six countries (Malaysia, Nigeria, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Iran) have higher level of globalization economically and technologically but they experience income divergence (inequality). In contrary, Bangladesh who is ranked the lowest in globalization economically and technologically, however, exhibits income convergence (equality).

This observation highly support the endogenous growth theory which predicts divergence because of increasing return to technological innovation in developed countries and the dependency approach which predicts that divergence is more likely because of differentiated in benefits from economic integration and trade and locked production structure in less developed nations. Thus, not necessary globalization will lead to income convergence of a country with respect to another developed country. As argued by Pritchett (1996), developing countries need "policy-conditional" conditional convergence. This could be learned from the examples of Japan, Korea and recently, China. That is, if a country's initial income is low and its government pursues growth-oriented policies, then very rapid growth rates may be possible. Sachs and Warner (1995) have also recently suggested that countries that adopted such policies did in fact exhibit very strong conditional convergence, while those poor countries that did not adopt them did not display any conditional convergence.

5. Conclusion.

This study aims to investigate the existence of income convergence and divergence among ten selected OIC countries. Using linear and non-linear stationary tests on income differentials between these countries and the United States, it is found that only Burkina Faso, Benin and Bangladesh exhibit income convergence (equality) while the rest of the countries exhibit income divergence (inequality). In link to degree of globalization in these countries, it could be concluded that those countries which ranked higher in term of globalization economically and technologically are also those that experience income divergence. But those ranked lower in degree of globalization economically and technologically exhibit income convergence. These stylized facts seem to support predictions of endogenous growth theory and dependency approach on relationship between globalization and income inequality.

References

Afxentiou, P.C. and A. Apostolos (1998), Convergence Across Canadian Provinces, *Canadian Journal of Regional Science* XXI(1):111-126.

Agenor P.R. (2003), Does globalization hurt the poor?, The World Bank, Unpublished manuscript.

Barro, R.J. and X. Sala-i-Martin (1992), Convergence, *Journal of Political Economy.* 100(2), pp. 223-251.

Cornia G.A. and J. Court (2001), Inequality, growth and poverty in the era of liberalization and globalization, WIDER Policy Brief No. 4.

Coulombe, S and J.F. Tremblay (2000), Human Capital and Regional Convergence in Canada, *Journal of Economic Studies* 28(3), pp. 154-180.

Coulombe, S. and F.C. Lee (1998), *Regional Economic Disparities in Canada*, University of Ottawa working paper 9317E, Ottawa.

Dickey, D. and W.A. Fuller (1979), Distribution of the Estimators for Time Series Regressors With A Unit Root, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 74, pp. 427-431.

Hofer, H. and A. Worgotter (1997), Regional Per Capita Income Convergence in Austria, *Regional Studies* 31(1), pp. 1-12.

Kapetanios, G., Y. Shin and A. Snell (2003), Testing for A Unit Root in the Non-linear STAR Framework, Journal of Econometrics 112, pp. 359-379.

Kearny A.T., Inc.n and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (2002), Globalization's last hurrah?, Foreign Policy January/February, pp. 38-51.

Kearny A.T., Inc.n and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (2003), Measuring globalization: Who's up, who's down?, Foreign Policy January/February, pp. 60-72.

Li, Q. and D.H. Papell (1999), Convergence of International Output: Time Series Evidence for 16 OECD Countries, *International Review of Economics and Finance* 8, pp. 267-280.

Liew, V.K.S. and K.P. Lim (2005), Income Divergence? Evidence of Non-linearity in the East Asian Economies, *Economics Bulletin*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 1-7.

Liew, V.K.S. and Y. Ahmad (2006), Income Convergence? Evidence of Non-linearity in the East Asian Economies: A Comment, MPRA Paper No. 519

Luukkonen, R., P. Saikkonen and T. Terasvirta (1988), Testing Linearity against Smooth Transition Autoregressive Models, *Biometrika* 75, pp. 491-499.

Maddison A. (2001), The world economy: A Millenial perspective, Development Centre Studies, OECD.

O'Rourke K.H. (2001), Globalization and inequality: Historical trends, *NBER* 2001:8339.

O'Rourke K.H. and J.G. Williamson (2000), Globalization and history: The evolution of a nineteenth-century Atlantic Economy. The MIT Press.

Pritchett, L. (1996), Forget Convergence: Divergence Past, Present and Future, *Finance and Development*, pp. 40-43.

Sachs J. and A. Warner (1995), Economic Reform and the Process of Global Interpretation, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*: 1, pp. 1-118

Solimano A. (2001), The evolution of world income inequality: Assessing the impact of globalization, ECLAC, UN.

Taylor, M.P. and Peel, D.A. (2000), Non-linear Adjustment, Long-run Equilibrium and Exchange Rate Fundamentals, *Journal of International Money and Finance* 19, pp. 33-53.

Wade R.H. (2001), Is globalization making the world income distribution more equal?, LSE Development Studies Institute, Working Paper Series 2001:01.

Williamson J.G. (2002), Winners and losers over two countries of globalization, WIDER Annual Lecture 6.