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Abstract

Thailand's economic base was gradually shifted from agricultural-based to industrial and service country for the last 30 years. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of those structural changes on economic performance using Cochrane - Orcutt and Newey-West Model.

For the result, an incremental employment in agricultural sector yielded the negative effect on economy. Also, an increase in employment in service sector was better than industrial sector in supporting economic growth. Thus, government of Thailand should no longer support agricultural sector but service-based economy instead.

---

1 Student of Master's Degree of Economics, Chiang Mai University, Thailand. It was self-interesting paper, not part of Thesis or curriculum's assignment.
**Background and Introduction**

Thailand is, as everyone known, agriculture-based country for a long time. With flourish nature, agriculture is, no need to say, first choice for sufficient living. But the question is "Is Thailand appropriate for being agricultural-based country?". Thai economist should answer some critiques that Thai people did agriculture because they can do it best relative to other economic base or they just have no potentials to do anything else.

However, economic structure in Thailand was dramatically changes for the last 30 years as shown in figure 1.

**Figure 1: Structural Changes in Thai Economy**

![Diagram showing employment changes](attachment:image.png)

**Source:** World Bank

According to the figure 1, employment in agriculture started decreasing since 1986 while employment in industry and service began increasing. It represented the structural change from agricultural-based country to be more industrialized and serviced. In 1986, 10.6 percent of employment was in industry while 66.7 and 22.6 were in agriculture and service sector, respectively. In 2012, structure was totally changed. Proportion of employment in agricultural sector decreased to 39.6 percent while increased to 20.9 and 39.4 percent in industry sector and service sector, respectively. However, the majority of employment was still in agricultural sector. Rice, Palm, Cassava, rubber, and kenaf were industrial or economic crop in Thailand. but the poor in Thailand was, by majority, farmer due to unstable price. Always, Thai government would very much like to intervene crop product by price floor or price ceiling. Recently, rice pledging from current government was populism aimed at winning election. With the problem of inefficient administration and corruption, the policy was failed.

Besides the revenue used to promote agriculture market, Thailand has accepted the way of international economic interdependent by encouraging investment and industrial sector. Many institutions were established aimed at managing and operating a flow of funds from multi-enterprise, for example, BOI. Additionally, service sector was dramatically
increasing, for example, financial sector (Banking), tourism (hotel and restaurant), and telecommunication. ADB (2013) studied services sector in Thailand and found that services sector plays a major role to Thailand's economic growth. Policies should be issued in supporting this sector. However, industrial sector is the main source of national prosperity, especially, the developed countries in Europe region. Newly Industrialized Country (NIC) like Thailand should not reject this kind of strategy.

**Objectives**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of changing economic structure in three kinds of pace including agricultural-based economy, industrial-based economy, and service-based economy on economic performance.

**Methodology and Model Specification**

Log-linear model was the main tool in analyzing. The coefficient of regressor in log-linear model was normalized as elasticity. Then, it was economic growth elasticity of an increase in employment in each sector. With time series data of the percentage of employment in agricultural, industrial, and service sector to total employment from 1986 - 2012, stationary test should be implemented firstly before running simple regression. There are three models as written;

\[
\log gdppc = \alpha + \beta \log ea
\]  
\[
\log gdppc = \alpha + \delta \log ei
\]  
\[
\log gdppc = \alpha + \varphi \log es
\]

where \( log gdppc \) stands for log of per capita GDP, \( \log ea \) stands for log of the proportion of employment in agricultural sector to total employment, and \( \beta \) stands for economic growth elasticity of an increase in agricultural employment.

where \( \log gdppc \) stands for log of per capita GDP, \( \log ei \) stands for log of the proportion of employment in industrial sector to total employment, and \( \delta \) stands for economic growth elasticity of an increase in industrial employment.

where \( \log gdppc \) stands for log of per capita GDP, \( \log es \) stands for log of the proportion of employment in service sector to total employment, and \( \varphi \) stands for economic growth elasticity of an increase in service employment.
Results

For stationary test, employment in industrial sector was stationary at lags(0) by 95% confidence. Employment in agricultural sector was stationary at lags(6) by 95% confidence. Employment in service sector was stationary at lags(4) by 95% confidence. Per capita GDP was stationary at lags(0) by 95% confidence.

After Unitroot test, the next was to find the relationship between economic growth and employment in each sector. Firstly, the relationship between per capita GDP and employment in industrial sector. The result suggested that an increase in employment in industrial sector by 1 percents can create an increase in per capita GDP by 2.1017. R-squared was 85.71%. There was no heteroskedasticity. However, there was autocorrelation tested by durbin watson method. Then, the model was solved by using cochrance - Orcutt Model. The result shown that an increase in employment in industrial sector by 1 percent can create an increase in per capita GDP by 0.3890 percent. The result was statistically significant.

Secondly, the relationship between per capita GDP and employment in agricultural sector. The result suggested that an increase in employment in agricultural sector by 1 percent can create a decrease in per capita GDP by 2.4913. R-squared was 93.56 which shows the strong relationship. However, there were heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation. The model was solve by using Newey-West method. The result shown that an increase in employment in agricultural sector by 1 percent can lead to a decrease in per capita GDP by 2.4913 percent. The result was statistically significant.

Thirdly, the relationship between per capita GDP and employment in service sector. The result suggested that an increase in employment in service sector by 1 percent can create an increase in per capita GDP by 2.043 percent. R-squared was 87.67%. However, there were autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity. The model was solved by using Newey-West. The result shown that an increase in employment in service sector by 1 percent can create per capita GDP by 2.043 percent. The result was statistically significant.

Conclusion

With the reliable econometric method and data availability in the sense of time series, any increase in employment in agricultural sector in Thailand yields the negative effect on economy. However, an increase in other sectors positively affect economic performance, especially service sector.

Policy Suggestion

1. Government should cut any programs that supports an expand in agricultural sector, especially market intervention, for example, rice pledging which can create an artificial incentive for people to be a new farmer so as to get the benefit from the program.
2. Thailand should reform to be service-based country like many developed countries. Service sector requires high quality of labor. Then, an improvement in education and health system should be policy priority.

3. Industrial sector also yields the positive effects to economy but its effect is statistically smaller than service sector. However, infrastructure and political stability are together an important factors in supporting this sector. Besides, a cut in tax (Tax holiday) or red tape should be more encouraged throughout economy.
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Regression Results (Stata)

1. Unitroot Test

```
tset year

    time variable: year, 1 to 27

    delta: 1 unit

    . dfuller logei

    Dickey-Fuller test for unit root      Number of obs = 26

                  ---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ----------
                        Test      1% Critical   5% Critical   10% Critical
                      Test
```
Statistic | Value | Value | Value | Value \\
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- \\
Z(t) | -2.970 | -3.743 | -2.997 | -2.629 \\

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.0378 

```
.dfuller logea
```

Dickey-Fuller test for unit root Number of obs = 26

```
---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ----------
Test | 1% Critical | 5% Critical | 10% Critical \\
Statistic | Value | Value | Value \\
--- | --- | --- | --- \\
Z(t) | -1.020 | -3.743 | -2.997 | -2.629 \\

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.7458 

```
.dfuller logea, lag(1)
```

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root Number of obs = 25

```
---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ----------
Test | 1% Critical | 5% Critical | 10% Critical \\
Statistic | Value | Value | Value \\
--- | --- | --- | --- \\
Z(t) | -0.857 | -3.750 | -3.000 | -2.630 \\
```
MacKinnon approximate p-value for $Z(t) = 0.8018$

`. dfuller logea, lag(2)`

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root      Number of obs = 24

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ----------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z(t)$</td>
<td>-1.342</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for $Z(t) = 0.6099$

`. dfuller logea, lag(3)`

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root      Number of obs = 23

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ----------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z(t)$</td>
<td>-1.922</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for $Z(t) = 0.3218$
. dfuller logea, lag(4)

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root  Number of obs =  22

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ---------
Test   1% Critical    5% Critical    10% Critical
Statistic    Value    Value    Value
Z(t)       -2.218       -3.750       -3.000       -2.630

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.1998

. dfuller logea, lag(5)

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root  Number of obs =  21

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ---------
Test   1% Critical    5% Critical    10% Critical
Statistic    Value    Value    Value
Z(t)       -1.956       -3.750       -3.000       -2.630

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.3060

. dfuller logea, lag(6)

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root  Number of obs =  20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z(t)</td>
<td>-2.995</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.0353

. dfuller loges

Dickey-Fuller test for unit root Number of obs = 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z(t)</td>
<td>-0.835</td>
<td>-3.743</td>
<td>-2.997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.8087

. dfuller loges, lag(1)

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root Number of obs = 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z(t)</td>
<td>-0.533</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
<td>-2.630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.8855

.dfuller loges, lag(2)

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root
Number of obs = 24

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ---------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z(t)</td>
<td>-1.193</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for Z(t) = 0.6765

.dfuller loges, lag(3)

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root
Number of obs = 23

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller ---------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z(t)</td>
<td>-2.305</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MacKinnon approximate p-value for $Z(t) = 0.1703$

```
.dfuller loges, lag(4)
```

Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for unit root  Number of obs = 22

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller --------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z(t)$</td>
<td>-3.520</td>
<td>-3.750</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for $Z(t) = 0.0075$

```
.dfuller logdppc
```

Dickey-Fuller test for unit root  Number of obs = 26

---------- Interpolated Dickey-Fuller --------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>1% Critical</th>
<th>5% Critical</th>
<th>10% Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z(t)$</td>
<td>-2.907</td>
<td>-3.743</td>
<td>-2.997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacKinnon approximate p-value for $Z(t) = 0.0445$
2. Regression Result

2.1 Test relationship between per capita GDP and employment in industrial sector

```
.reg  loggdppc logei
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number of obs = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>5.10407605</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.10407605</td>
<td>Prob &gt; F = 0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.851297796</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.034051912</td>
<td>R-squared = 0.8571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adj R-squared = 0.8513

| Total | 5.95537385 | 26 | .22905284 | Root MSE = .18453 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>loggdppc</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P&gt;t</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>logei</td>
<td>2.101672</td>
<td>.1716632</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.748125 2.455219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td>2.448931</td>
<td>.4936044</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.432333 3.465528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
.hettest
```

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity

Ho: Constant variance

Variables: fitted values of loggdppc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chi2(1)</th>
<th>= 1.97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi2</td>
<td>= 0.1609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
. dwstat

Durbin-Watson d-statistic(  2,    27) =   .314803

. prais  loggdppc logei, corc

Iteration 0:  rho = 0.0000
Iteration 1:  rho = 0.8941
Iteration 2:  rho = 0.9152
Iteration 3:  rho = 0.9252
Iteration 4:  rho = 0.9314
Iteration 5:  rho = 0.9357
Iteration 6:  rho = 0.9389
Iteration 7:  rho = 0.9414
Iteration 8:  rho = 0.9434
Iteration 9:  rho = 0.9451
Iteration 10: rho = 0.9464
Iteration 11: rho = 0.9476
Iteration 12: rho = 0.9486
Iteration 13: rho = 0.9494
Iteration 14: rho = 0.9502
Iteration 15: rho = 0.9508
Iteration 16: rho = 0.9514
Iteration 17: rho = 0.9519
Iteration 18: rho = 0.9524
Iteration 19: rho = 0.9528
Iteration 20: \( \rho = 0.9532 \)
Iteration 21: \( \rho = 0.9535 \)
Iteration 22: \( \rho = 0.9538 \)
Iteration 23: \( \rho = 0.9541 \)
Iteration 24: \( \rho = 0.9543 \)
Iteration 25: \( \rho = 0.9545 \)
Iteration 26: \( \rho = 0.9547 \)
Iteration 27: \( \rho = 0.9549 \)
Iteration 28: \( \rho = 0.9551 \)
Iteration 29: \( \rho = 0.9552 \)
Iteration 30: \( \rho = 0.9554 \)
Iteration 31: \( \rho = 0.9555 \)
Iteration 32: \( \rho = 0.9556 \)
Iteration 33: \( \rho = 0.9557 \)
Iteration 34: \( \rho = 0.9558 \)
Iteration 35: \( \rho = 0.9559 \)
Iteration 36: \( \rho = 0.9560 \)
Iteration 37: \( \rho = 0.9561 \)
Iteration 38: \( \rho = 0.9562 \)
Iteration 39: \( \rho = 0.9562 \)
Iteration 40: \( \rho = 0.9563 \)
Iteration 41: \( \rho = 0.9563 \)
Iteration 42: \( \rho = 0.9564 \)
Iteration 43: \( \rho = 0.9564 \)
Iteration 44: \( \rho = 0.9565 \)
Iteration 45: \( \rho = 0.9565 \)
Iteration 46: \( \rho = 0.9566 \)
Iteration 47: $\rho = 0.9566$
Iteration 48: $\rho = 0.9566$
Iteration 49: $\rho = 0.9567$
Iteration 50: $\rho = 0.9567$
Iteration 51: $\rho = 0.9567$
Iteration 52: $\rho = 0.9567$
Iteration 53: $\rho = 0.9568$
Iteration 54: $\rho = 0.9568$
Iteration 55: $\rho = 0.9568$
Iteration 56: $\rho = 0.9568$
Iteration 57: $\rho = 0.9568$
Iteration 58: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 59: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 60: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 61: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 62: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 63: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 64: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 65: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 66: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 67: $\rho = 0.9569$
Iteration 68: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 69: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 70: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 71: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 72: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 73: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 74: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 75: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 76: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 77: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 78: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 79: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 80: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 81: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 82: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 83: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 84: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 85: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 86: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 87: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 88: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 89: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 90: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 91: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 92: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 93: $\rho = 0.9570$
Iteration 94: $\rho = 0.9570$

Cochrane-Orcutt AR(1) regression -- iterated estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number of obs = 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01122296</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01122296</td>
<td>Prob &gt; F = 0.0186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F(1, 24) = 6.37$
2.2 Test relationship between per capita GDP and employment in agricultural sector

```
. reg logdppc logea

 Source        SS       df       MS              Number of obs =      27
               F(  1,    25) =  363.26
 Model    5.5719042     1   5.5719042           Prob > F      =  0.0000
 Residual   .383469649    25  .015338786           R-squared     =  0.9356
 Adj R-squared =  0.9330
 Total   5.95537385    26   .22905284           Root MSE      =  .12385
```
loggdppc  Coef.  Std. Err.  t  P>t  [95% Conf. Interval]

logea  -2.491307  .1307136  -19.06  0.000  -2.760517  -2.222097
_cons   18.21089  .5113003  35.62  0.000   17.15784   19.26393

.hettest

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity

Ho: Constant variance
Variables: fitted values of loggdppc

chi2(1)  =  6.36
Prob > chi2 =  0.0116

.dwstat

Durbin-Watson d-statistic( 2,  27) = .6208789

.newey loggdppc logea, lag(0)

Regression with Newey-West standard errors  Number of obs = 27
maximum lag: 0  F( 1,  25) = 245.90
Prob > F =  0.0000

Newey-West
2.3 Test relationship between per capita GDP and employment in service sector

. reg loggdppc loges

Source SS df MS Number of obs = 27
F( 1, 25) = 177.83
Model 5.22132485 1 5.22132485 Prob > F = 0.0000
Residual .734048991 25 .02936196 R-squared = 0.8767
Adj R-squared = 0.8718
Total 5.95537385 26 .22905284 Root MSE = .17135

loggdppc Coef. Std. Err. t P>t [95% Conf. Interval]
loges 2.042983 .1532029 13.34 0.000 1.727456 2.35851
_cons 1.48272 .5254955 2.82 0.009 .4004416 2.564998

.hettest
Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity

Ho: Constant variance

Variables: fitted values of loggdppc

\[ \text{chi2}(1) = 6.57 \]
\[ \text{Prob} > \text{chi2} = 0.0104 \]

.dwstat

Durbin-Watson d-statistic( 2, 27) = .4648503

.newey loggdppc loges, lag(0)

Regression with Newey-West standard errors Number of obs = 27
maximum lag: 0 F( 1, 25) = 142.18

\[ \text{Prob} > F = 0.0000 \]

Newey-West

| loggdppc  | Coef. | Std. Err. | t   | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|-----------|-------|-----------|-----|-----|----------------------|
| loges     | 2.042983 | .1713343 | 11.92 | 0.000 | 1.690114    2.395853 |
| _cons     | 1.48272 | .6076503 | 2.44 | 0.022 | .2312406    2.734199 |

.................................................................