



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Causal linkages between electricity
consumption and GDP in Thailand:
evidence from the bounds test**

Jiranyakul, Komain

National Institute of Development Administration

November 2014

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/60284/>
MPRA Paper No. 60284, posted 01 Dec 2014 03:39 UTC

Causal Linkages between Electricity Consumption and GDP in Thailand: Evidence from the Bounds Test

Komain Jiranyakul, School of Development Economics, National Institute of Development Administration, Thailand. Email: komain_j@hotmail.com

Abstract: This paper investigates the causal relationship between electricity consumption and real GDP by applying the bounds testing for cointegration in a multivariate framework. The error correction mechanism is employed to detect causal relationship in the presence of cointegration among three variables. Empirical results for Thailand during 2001Q1 and 2014Q2 suggest that there is long-run bidirectional causality between electricity consumption and real GDP. The source of causation in the long run is found by the significance of the error correction terms in both directions. In the short run, bidirectional causal relationship between electricity consumption and economic growth is also observed. The findings give implications for electricity efficiency and alternative energy sources in the long run.

Keywords: Causality, electricity consumption, economic growth

JEL Classification: Q43, C32

1. Introduction

Previous studies investigate the impact of energy consumption on real GDP using popular cointegration techniques to find a long-run relationship between the two variables. Both short-run and long-run causality have been examined in advanced and developing or emerging market economies. There can be unidirectional or bidirectional causality between energy and GDP. It is also possible that the neutrality hypothesis exists, i.e., energy consumption does not cause GDP or GDP does not cause energy consumption. Earlier study by Kraft and Kraft (1978) shows that energy consumption Granger causes GNP in the United States during 1947 and 1974. However, Yu and Jin (1992) and, among others, find a long-run causality of energy consumption to output while Glausure and Lee (1997) find bidirectional causality between energy consumption and GDP in South Korea and Singapore. Asafu-Adjaye (2000) estimates the causal relationships between energy consumption and income for India, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand. He finds directional causality running from energy consumption to income in India and Indonesia and bidirectional causality in the Philippines and Thailand. Oh and Lee (2004) re-examine the causal relationship between energy consumption and real GDP in Korea over the period 1970-1999 by estimating a vector error correction mechanism to perform the Granger causality test and find a long-run bidirectional causality between energy consumption and GDP.

Many researchers have focused on electricity consumption that can affect real GDP because electricity generation and sales have induced much attention to policy debate. Yoo (2005) investigates both short-run and long-run causality between electricity consumption and economic growth in South Korea over the 1970-2002 period, and finds bidirectional causality between the two variables. Ho and Siu (2007) find

unidirectional causality running from electricity consumption to real GDP in Hong Kong. Chen et al. (2007) find that the directions of causality between electricity consumption and real GDP are mixed among ten Asian economies when the data for individual countries are analyzed. However, a bidirectional causality is found in the panel data analysis. Narayan and Smyth (2009) use a panel dataset in the Middle Eastern countries to examine the relationship between electricity consumption and GDP and find bidirectional causation between the two variables. Chandran et al. (2010) examine the relationship between electricity consumption and real GDP for Malaysia during 1971 and 2003. They find that electricity consumption, real GDP and price are cointegrated. In addition, there is a unidirectional causality running from electricity consumption to economic growth. Sami (2011) finds that real per capita income causes electricity consumption in Japan. Faisal and Nirmalya (2013) find that electricity consumption does not cause growth in India, but there is bidirectional causality between the two variables in Pakistan. Halkos and Tzeremes (2014) use a sample of 35 countries over the 1990-2011 period to examine the relationship between electricity consumption from renewable sources and GDP. They find that electricity consumption from renewable sources will not cause higher GDP in emerging and developing countries.

The main objective of the present study is to examine the causal links between electricity consumption and real GDP in Thailand. The available data from 2000Q1 to 2014Q2 are used. The bounds test or autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) procedure is employed. The main finding is that there is long-run bidirectional causality between real GDP and electricity consumption. The paper is organized as the following. The next section presents the data description and method of estimation. Section 3 gives empirical results. The final section concludes.

2. Data and Methodology

Quarterly data during 2000Q1 and 2014Q2 are used in the analysis. The data of electricity consumption are obtained from Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand and Provincial Electricity Authority, Ministry of Interior. Energy price index series is obtained from Bureau of trade and economic indices, Ministry of commerce. Real GDP series is obtained from the office of National Economic and Social Development Board. These available data are also tabulated by the Bank of Thailand. Energy consumption is measured in billion kilowatt hours while GDP at 1988 constant prices is measured in billions of baht. All series are transformed to logarithmic series. The number of observations is 58.

In this study, the bounds testing for cointegration proposed by Peraran et al. (2001) is adopted. The procedure is used to test for the existence of level relationship between a variable and its regressors when the order of integration of each variable is not certainly known. Even though unit root tests are not required, this procedure is not applicable when any series is integrated of order larger than one. The variables in the model can be either integrated of order zero, $I(0)$, or integrated of order one, $I(1)$, or might be mixed between $I(0)$ and $I(1)$.

The stationarity property of the data is tested using the PP tests by Phillips and Perron (1998) on first differences of the series and the results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Results of unit root tests

Variable	PP test (constant)	PP test (constant and a linear trend)
Δec	-10.730 [13] (0.000)***	-10.705 [13] (0.001)***
Δp	-14.608 [55] (0.000)***	-15.891 [55] (0.001)***
Δy	-13.607 [16] (0.000)***	-17.330 [15] (0.001)***

Note: Δ denotes first difference operator. The variables: ec is electricity consumption, p is energy price index, and y is real GDP. The number in bracket is optimal bandwidth determined by Bartlett kernel. The number in parenthesis is the probability of accepting the null hypothesis of unit root. *** indicates significance at the 1 percent level.

The results in Table 1 ensure that the maximum order of integration of the three variables is one because the null hypothesis of unit root is rejected. Therefore, the bounds test is applicable to the data. This bounds test can provide unbiased long-run estimates and valid test statistics. The long-run equilibrium relationship between energy consumption, consumer price index and manufacturing production can be express as:

$$ec_t = \alpha_{10} + \alpha_{11}p_t + \alpha_{12}y_t + e_t \quad (1)$$

$$p_t = \alpha_{20} + \alpha_{21}ec_t + \alpha_{22}y_t + e_t \quad (2)$$

$$y_t = \alpha_{30} + \alpha_{31}ec_t + \alpha_{32}p_t + e_t \quad (3)$$

where Δ denotes first difference operator, ec is the log of electricity consumption, p is the log of energy price index, and y is the log of real GDP. Equation (1) represents the demand side approach or electricity demand function. Because of the unavailability of electricity price series, the energy price index, denoted by p , is used as a proxy of electricity price. Chandran et al. (2010) and Oh and Lee (2004) use consumer price index as a proxy of electricity price due to the lack of the data of electricity price. Equation (2) is used to examine the impact of electricity consumption and real GDP on price while equation (3) is used to examine the impact of electricity consumption and price on real GDP.

The unrestricted error correction models of this ARDL procedure can be expressed as:

$$\Delta ec_t = a_0 + a_1 ec_{t-1} + a_2 p_{t-1} + a_3 y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p1} \beta_i \Delta ec_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{p2} \gamma_j \Delta p_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{p3} \phi_k \Delta y_{t-k} + \varepsilon_t \quad (4)$$

$$\Delta p_t = a_0 + a_1 p_{t-1} + a_2 ec_{t-1} + a_3 y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p1} \beta_i \Delta p_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{p2} \gamma_j ec_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{p3} \phi_k \Delta y_{t-k} + \varepsilon_t \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta y_t = a_0 + a_1 y_{t-1} + a_2 ec_{t-1} + a_3 p_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p1} \beta_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{p2} \gamma_j \Delta ec_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{p3} \phi_k \Delta p_{t-k} + \varepsilon_t \quad (6)$$

There are two steps in the bounds testing for cointegration. The first step is to estimate equations (4) – (6) using ordinary least squares method to determine the existence of a long-run relationship between the three variables. This is done by conducting an F test for the joint significance of the coefficients of lagged level variables. The null hypothesis $H_0 : a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = 0$ is tested against the alternative hypothesis $H_a : a_1 \neq a_2 \neq a_3 \neq 0$. In other words, the models in equations (4) – (6) are tested against the models without lagged level variables, which are the ARDL ($p1, p2, p3$) models, to obtain the computed F-statistics. If cointegration exists, the computed F-statistic will be larger than the upper bound critical value. If cointegration does not exist, the computed F-statistic will be smaller than the lower bound critical value. The computed F-statistic that takes the value between the upper bound and lower bound critical values will lead to an inconclusive result. The existence of cointegration gives the error correction mechanism (ECM) expressed as:

$$\Delta ec_t = a_0 + \lambda e_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p1} \beta_i \Delta ec_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{p2} \gamma_j \Delta p_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{p3} \phi_k \Delta y_{t-k} + u_t \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta p_t = a_0 + \lambda e_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p1} \beta_i \Delta p_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{p2} \gamma_j \Delta ec_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{p3} \phi_k \Delta y_{t-k} + u_t \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta y_t = a_0 + \lambda e_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p1} \beta_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^{p2} \gamma_j \Delta ec_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{p3} \phi_k \Delta p_{t-k} + u_t \quad (9)$$

where e_{t-1} is the error correction term (ETC), which is the one-period lag of residuals obtained from the ordinary least squares estimate of level relationship between the three variables. The coefficient λ is the speed of adjustment toward the long-run equilibrium. The models in equations (7) – (9) depict short-run dynamics and show how fast any deviation from the long-run equilibrium will be corrected. The significance of the coefficient of the ETC also indicates a long-run causality running from the regressors to the dependent variable. The main advantage of the conditional ARDL procedure in testing for cointegration is that re-parameterization of the model into the equivalent vector error correction model is not required compared with other techniques of cointegration tests. The ECM representations show short-run relationship between changes in levels of the three variables and their lags. In testing for long-run causality between electricity consumption and economic growth, the Wald test with coefficient restrictions can be used to test the null hypothesis $H_0: \lambda=0$ for equations (7) and (9) against the alternative that it is not equal to zero. For short-run causality, the null hypothesis $H_0: \phi_k=0$ for equation (7), and $H_0: \gamma_j =0$ in equation (9) against the alternative hypothesis that they are not equal zero. In addition, strong causality tests can be performed on the null hypothesis $H_0: \lambda=\phi_k=0$ in equation (7) and $H_0: \lambda=\gamma_j=0$ in equation (9). These tests are performed by Ho and Lee (2004), Narayan and Smyth (2009, among others).

3. Empirical Results

Since the variables may be I(0) or I(1) series, or are mutually cointegrated, the bounds test is performed to the models specified in the previous section. According to Pesaran and Shin (1999), one can obtain the preferred ECM representation in cointegration analysis. In case of small sample size in the present study, the preferred ECMs are obtained by choosing suitable parsimonious ARDL models, which include the dummy variable, $D0709_t$, to detect the impact of the subprime crisis on level relationships of the three variables. This dummy variable is defined as $D0709$ is 1 over the period 2007Q4-2009Q2, and zero elsewhere. The results of cointegration test are reported in Table 2.

Table 2 Results of cointegration test

Order of variable	ARDL (p1, p2, p3)	Serial correlation ($\chi^2_{(2)}$)	Computed F
(ec, p, y)	(2,1,1)	1.308 (p-value = 0.520)	6.79
(p, ec, y)	(2,1,1)	2.481 (p-value = 0.289)	3.20
(y, ec, p)	(2,1,0)	2.903 (p-value = 0.234)	31.66
Critical F	1 percent	5 percent	10 percent
Upper bound	7.84	4.85	4.14
Lower bound	6.48	3.79	3.17

Note: The variables: *ec* is electricity consumption, *p* is energy price index, and *y* is real GDP. P-value is the probability of accepting the null hypothesis of no serial correlation in the residuals. Critical F statistic is obtained from Table CI (iii) Case III in Pesaran et al., 2001.

The results from Table 2 show that the chosen ARDL models are free of serial correlation because the Chi-square statistics show that the null hypothesis of no serial correlation is accepted. When electricity consumption is the dependent variable as specified in equation (4), the computed F statistic is 6.79, which is greater than the 5% upper bound critical value of 4.85, and thus cointegration exists. On the contrary, if energy price is the dependent variable, the computed F statistic is 3.20, which is between the upper and lower bound critical values at the 10% level of significance, and the result is inconclusive. The VAR/Block Granger causality test is performed on first differences of the three variables and the results show that only the price variable is exogenous. For the model with real GDP as the dependent variable, the computed F-statistic is 31.66, which is greater than the 1% upper bound critical value, and thus cointegration exists. It can be concluded that there are two cointegrating equations that should be further analyzed. Table 3 reports the results of level relationship and short-run dynamics when electricity consumption is the dependent variable.

In the long run, a one percent increase in real GDP causes an increase in electricity consumption by 0.54 percent (Panel A of Table 3). This indicates that real GDP is one of the main determinants of electricity consumption. Therefore, the estimated equation illustrates the contribution of real GDP electricity consumption. The impact of price on electricity consumption is significantly positive, which implies that the economy depends on electricity regardless of the increasing trend of price. The short-

run dynamics result from ECM estimate is illustrated in Panel B of Table 3. In the short run, the relationship between output growth and a change in electricity consumption is positive, but is not statistically significant. Furthermore, only the coefficient of lagged economic growth is statistically significant. Therefore, a change in real GDP does affect the electricity consumption in the short run in the sense of causality. The negative impact of the subprime crisis in the short-run is visible. The estimated coefficient of the ECT (e_{t-1}) is significantly negative and takes the absolute value of less than one. This indicates that any deviation from long-run equilibrium will be corrected. In addition, there is long-run causality from real GDP to electricity consumption. This is done by testing the null hypothesis that the estimated coefficient λ in the ECM is zero. The Wald F-statistic is 4.99 ($p=0.03$) is obtained, and thus the null hypothesis that there is no long-run causality is rejected at the 5 percent level of significant. The Wald F-statistic for short-run causality is 4.54 ($p=0.16$) and the null hypothesis of no short-run causality is rejected. For strong causality test, the F-statistic is 4.03 ($p=0.02$), which lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no strong causality.

Table 3 Results of long-run and short-run dynamics estimates of the impact of price and real GDP on electricity consumption, 2000Q1 to 2014Q2

Panel A. Long-run estimation
with ec_t as dependent variable

	Coefficient
p_t	0.367 (4.730)***
y_t	0.542 (4.252)***
Constant	-1.865 (3.389)***
Adjusted R ²	0.910

Panel B. ECM estimation with Δec_t as
dependent variable

e_t (ECT)	-0.349 (-2.233)**
Δec_{t-1}	-0.112 (-0.744)
Δec_{t-2}	-0.596 (-4.469)***
Δp_t	0.116 (1.758)*
Δp_{t-1}	0.078 (1.019)
Δy_t	0.022 (0.156)
Δy_{t-1}	-0.324 (-2.991)***
$D0709_t$	-0.039 (-2.666)**
constant	0.025 (4.168)***
Adjusted R ²	0.653
Diagnostic tests:	
Functional form (FF)	0.146 ($p=0.702$)
Serial correlation (LM)	4.043 ($p=0.133$)
Normality (Jarque Bera)	0.024 ($p=0.433$)
Heteroskedasticity (ARCH)	0.024 ($p=0.054$)

Note: The variables: ec is electricity consumption, p is energy price index, and y is real GDP. The number in parenthesis is t-statistic. p is the probability of accepting the null hypotheses that there is no serial correlation, no heteroskedasticity, and residuals are normally distributed. *** ** and * denote significance at the 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

The other cointegrating equation and short-run dynamics estimates are shown in Table 4. In the long run, a one percent increase in electricity consumption causes an increase in real GDP by 0.46 percent (Panel A of Table 4). This result indicates that electricity consumption is a crucial determinant of real GDP. Therefore, the estimated equation illustrates the contribution of electricity consumption to real GDP. The impact of price on real GDP is also positive. The short-run dynamics result from ECM estimate is illustrated in Panel B of Table 4. In the short run, the relationship between output growth and a change in electricity consumption is positive, but is not statistically significant. Furthermore, the estimated coefficient of lagged change in electricity consumption is positive and significant. Therefore, a change in electricity consumption does affect the growth rate in the short run. There is no impact of the subprime crisis in the short run. The estimated coefficient of the ECT (e_{t-1}) is significantly negative and takes the absolute value of less than one. This indicates that any deviation from long-run equilibrium will be corrected. In addition, a long-run causality running from electricity consumption to real GDP is found by testing coefficient restrictions on ECM. The Wald F-statistic for long-run causality between electricity consumption and real GDP is 40.11 ($p=0.00$). The Wald F-statistics for short-run causality and strong causality are 23.33 ($p=0.00$) and 21.02 ($p=0.00$), respectively.

Table 4 Results of long-run and short-run dynamics estimates of the impact of electricity consumption and price on real GDP, 2000Q1 to 2014Q2

Panel A. Long-run estimation with y_t as dependent variable	
	Coefficient
ec_t	0.457 (4.252)***
p_t	0.296 (3.704)***
Constant	4.011 (31.537)***
Adjusted R^2	0.903
Panel B. ECM estimation with Δy_t as dependent variable	
e_{t-1} (ECT)	-0.827 (-6.333)***
Δy_{t-1}	0.055 (0.488)
Δy_{t-2}	-0.235 (-2.147)**
Δec_t	0.052 (0.598)
Δec_{t-1}	-0.565 (-6.816)***
Δp_t	0.094 (1.812)*
$D0709_t$	-0.012 (-1.062)
constant	0.017 (3.727)***
Adjusted R^2	0.709
Diagnostic tests:	
Functional form (FF)	3.083 ($p=0.079$)
Serial correlation (LM)	3.334 ($p=0.189$)
Normality (Jarque Bera)	3.775 ($p=0.151$)
Heteroskedasticity (ARCH)	0.120 ($p=0.729$)

Note: The variables: ec is electricity consumption, p is energy price index, and y is real GDP. The number in parenthesis is t-statistic. p is the probability of accepting the null hypotheses that there is no serial correlation, no heteroskedasticity, and residuals are normally distributed. ***, ** and * denote significance at the 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

It should be noted that the preferred ECMs are chosen because they pass the four main diagnostic tests. The results show that there are both long-run and short-run bidirectional causalities between electricity consumption and real GDP in Thailand. The findings are consistent with those of Glasure and Lee (1997), Yoo (2005) and Narayan and Smyth (2009). The results are also contradictory to the electricity neutrality hypothesis.

The findings in the present study give policy implications for the country, including some other emerging market economies. Since the economy is dependent on electricity consumption, measures that can improve electricity supply efficiency deem necessary. Investing more in electricity infrastructure and setting up measures for energy conservation will help in achieving the long-run growth.

4. Conclusion

This study examines the causality between electricity consumption and economic growth for Thailand during 2000Q1 and 2014Q2. The bounds test in a trivariate framework is employed. The causality tests are performed using ECMs to detect long-run causalities between the two variables. The empirical results show the existence of long-run bidirectional causal relationship between real GDP and electricity consumption. The sources of long-run linkages are found from the ECTs in both directions. In addition, there exists short-run bidirectional causalities between the two variables. The limitation of the present study is that the availability of time series data of electricity consumption in a short time span, even though the long-run relationships are found

References

- Asafu-Adjaye, J., 2000. "The relationship between energy consumption, energy prices, and economic growth: time series evidence from Asian developing countries," *Energy Economics*, 22(), 615-625.
- Chandran, V. G. R., Shama, S., and Madhavan, K., 2010. "Electricity consumption-growth nexus: the case of Malaysia," *Energy Policy*, 38(1), 606-612.
- Chen, S. T., Kou, H. I., and Chen, C.C., 2007. "The relationship between GDP and electricity consumption in 10 Asian countries," *Energy Policy*, 35(4), 2611-2621.
- Faisal, A., and Nirmalya, C., 2013. "Electricity consumption-economic growth nexus: an aggregated and disaggregated causality analysis in India and Pakistan," *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 35(4), 538-553.
- Ghosh, S., 2002. "Electricity consumption and economic growth in India," *Energy Policy*, 30(2), 125-129.
- Glasure, Y. U., and Lee, A. R., 1997. "Cointegration, error-correction, and the relationship between GDP and energy: the case of South Korea and Singapore," *Resource and Energy Economics*, 20(), 17-25.

Halkos, G. E., and Tzeremes, N. G., 2014. "The effect of electricity consumption from renewable sources on countries' economic growth levels: evidence from advanced, emerging and developing economies," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 39(C), 166-173.

Ho, C. Y., and Siu, K. W., 2007. "A dynamic equilibrium of electricity consumption and GDP in Hong Kong: an empirical investigation," *Energy Policy*, 35(4), 2507-2513.

Narayan, P. K., and Smyth, R., 2009. "Multivariate Granger causality between electricity consumption, exports and GDP: evidence from a panel of Middle Eastern countries," *Energy Policy*, 37(1), 299-236.

Oh, W., and Lee, K., 2004. "Causal relationship between energy consumption and GDP revisited: the case of Korea, 1970-1999," *Energy Economics*, 26(1), 51-59.

Pesaran, M. H., and Shin, Y., 1999. "An autoregressive distributed lag modeling approach to cointegration analysis," Chapter 11 in *Econometrics and Economic Theory in the 20th Century: The Ragnar Frisch Centennial Symposium*, Strom, S. (ed.) Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Pesaran, M. H., Shin, Y., and Smith, R. J., 2001. "Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of level relationships," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 16(3), 289-326.

Phillips, P. C. B., and Perron, P., 1988. "Testing for a unit root in time series regression," *Biometrika*, 75(2), 335-346.

Sami, J., 2011. "Multivariate cointegration and causality between exports, electricity consumption and real income per capita: recent evidence from Japan," *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 1(3), 59-68.

Yoo, S-H., 2005. "Electricity consumption and economic growth: evidence from Korea," *Energy Policy*, 33(12), 1637-1632.