

Modeling the dynamics of sectoral TFP growth in Ethiopia: Explaining persistent economic debacles

Zerayehu Sime Eshete¹, Peter Kiko Kimuyu²

¹PhD in Economics, Collaborative Masters Program in Economic Development, Debre Markos University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

²Professor of Economics, School of Economics, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

Email address

zerayehu2005@yahoo.com (Z. S. Eshete), pkimyu@uonbi.ac.ke (P. K. Kimuyu)

To cite this article

Zerayehu Sime Eshete, Peter Kiko Kimuyu. Modeling the Dynamics of Sectoral TFP Growth in Ethiopia: Explaining Persistent Economic Debacles. *American Journal of Business, Economics and Management*. Vol. 2, No. 5, 2014, pp. 144-162.

Abstract

This paper provides a rigorous analysis for modeling the dynamics of sectoral total factor productivity growth in Ethiopia over the period 1970 - 2010. It also attempts to estimate total factor productivity growth rate for agriculture, industry and service sector using sectoral growth accounting approach, and then examines determinants that affect sectoral productivity by employing a vector autoregressive model that incorporates exogenous variables. The study then finds that sectoral economic growth largely depends on factor accumulation instead of factor productivity. As a result of this, labour becomes the dominant source of agricultural growth while capital deepening explains the immense source of growth in industry and services over the reference period, regardless of the various political economy regimes. Total factor productivity growth, however, is negative on average across economic sectors and heavily reflects the lack of efficiency and technological change that bottlenecked economic growth. The study also finds that economy openness, imported capital goods, and service liberalization are statistically significant variable and positively influence the sectoral total factor productivity growth in agriculture, industry and service sector respectively. The study therefore recommends that the government focuses on widening economy openness in order to driving up agricultural total factor productivity, and pays more attention to importation of strategic technologies and reduces trade and service barriers associated with in order to foster industrial and service total factor productivity respectively.

Keywords

Structural Change Process, Sectoral TFP, Sectoral Growth Accounting Approach, VARX Model, Zivot and Andrews Test, Stationarity Test with Structural Break, Clemete, Montanes and Reyes Test

1. Introduction

The performance of the world economy has astonishingly been changed in terms of growth rate, economic structure, investment, trade, product diversification, and the like. The world also becomes a village due to a multifaceted globalization effect in general and information technology in particular. As a result, the per capita growth rate that was around 0.05 percent in the 18th century tended to be around 2 percent on average in the 20th century (Lin, 2012). However, there is always permanent difference in income level across countries. For instance, the Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) region that had 612 million populations produced a GDP of only US

\$315 billion, as measured in constant 2000 US\$, in 1997. This is lower than that of Netherland that had around 15 million populations. However, the level of GDP in SSA region exceeded that of Netherland, and the economy grew by 4.8 percent in SSA while it was only 1.7 percent in Netherland in 2010. There is still an incomparable wide variation in real per capita income, SSA and Netherland accounted for \$641 and \$26,557 respectively (WB, 2011).

One of the argumentative questions raised here is that why such type variations are occurred among countries and what matter in this regard till economic convergence catches up the world production frontier in long run. This is heavily attributed to difference in total factor productivity and technological gap that developing country not able to catch

the world technology frontier through international spill-over effect. This entails a special attention of catching-up productivity growth depending on initial condition and accessing the stock of knowledge of abroad (Kumar and Russell, 2002 and Nelson and Phelps, 1966).

Ethiopia is one of strategic countries in this regard because of economic debacles which existed inherently and persistently associated with productivity growth, widening the gap between domestic technology and world technology frontiers. The level of technological innovation in the domestic economy is poor and uncompetitive and that of technology transfer from abroad is very limited with various trade and service barriers in the last decades. As a result of this, the Ethiopian economy has poorly performed and became the world agenda in case of abysmal poverty, recurrent food deficiency, instability, erratic growth and sluggish economic transformation (Rahmato, 2004 and Chole, 1992). The economy exhibits a mixed performance of positive and negative real GDP growth rate. It shows negative growth rate performances seven times over the period 1981-2010 (WB, 2011).

In addition, the structure of the GDP is characterized by lowest and stagnant share of the manufacturing sector (4.8 percent on average) that was expected to drive productivity and sustainable growth. The highest share of service sector in GDP in turn leads to a structural change burden as explained by Baumol's disease, causing economic growth rate to decline in the long run (Baumol, 1967). The study, therefore, examines the determinants and driving forces of the dynamics of TFP (total factor productivity) growth for agriculture, industry and service sector in search of perpetual growth and rapid structural change. The main research questions that the paper addresses are the following: What do explain the Ethiopian economic growth at sectoral level: factor accumulation or productivity growth? What does the sectoral TFP performance look like? What are the factors that

influence the sectoral TFP growth in order to drive a perpetual growth rate and structural change? The study employs sectoral growth accounting approach and VARX (autoregressive model that incorporates exogenous variables) model in order to estimate sectoral TFP growth and examine the determinants of sectoral TFP growth over the period 1972-2010.

2. Macroeconomic Performance and Political Regimes

The Ethiopian economy has experienced various growth options in different fashions in the past three main political regime changes with different economic policy shifts. Mixture of feudo-capitalism and state-owned economic policy are the fundamental economic policy of the government in the imperial regime (1940-1974) and the socialist regime (1974-1991) respectively. The current reformist government (1991 to date) has subsequently undertaken a series economic reform program of WB and IMF with various phases of Neo liberalization and State-led development (MOFED, 2010).

The macroeconomic performance over the decades has been showing a mixed performance as measured by inflation rate. Historically, it was low relative to other sub-Saharan African countries. The first historic level of inflation was 21% in 1991/92, mainly owing to the forceful political power transition from the socialist government to the current regime. However, the recent inflationary spiral unprecedentedly increased despite good harvest of agricultural produce. The general inflation reached 37.2% as of September 2008 while food inflation was 51.8% (CSA, 2008; NBE 2007 and NBE, 2011).

The summary of macroeconomic performance over the decades is presented as follows (Table 1).

Table 1. Major Macroeconomic Performance Indicators

Major Macroeconomic Indicators	Part of Socialist Regime (1980-1990)	Neo-Liberalization Regime (1991-2000)	Pro-Poor growth Regime (2001-2010)
Total investment(% of GDP)	16.2	15.0	23.3
Gross national savings (% of GDP)	6.8	10.1	19.7
Government revenue(% of GDP)	14.4	13.7	18.4
Government expenditure(% of GDP)	18.5	18.7	21.9
Grant, excluding technical support (USD)	0.30	0.54	1.96
Broad Money (% of GDP)	20.0	29.7	38.6*
Total Reserve (in months of Import)	2.3	4.3	3.05*
Inflation rate	5.2	7.5	11.1
Total Export (percent of GDP)	6.5	8.7	12.7
Total Import (percent of GDP)	11.6	16.4	30.4

Source: WB Report 2011, and IMF Report 2012, online database

N.B: *data for both broad money and total reserve presented here up to 2008 and 2009 respectively.

With respect to foreign currency reserve, the country's gross official reserve when the socialist government was toppled in 1991/92 was almost nil, equivalent to 1.3 weeks of imports. It recovers up to 6 months of import coverage in the first phase of liberalization, due to the balance of payment support by donors augmented by the increase in export

earnings. However, it exhibited a declining trend and dwindled to cover only 3.6, 2.3 and 2.2 months of imports as of June 2005, 2006, and 2007, respectively. The reserve position was 5 weeks of import coverage in December 2008 and created a deadlock situation especially for investment activities (Kagnev and Zerayehu, 2009). The recent

macroeconomic instability that mainly was caused by historically unprecedented inflation and acute shortage of foreign currency reserve that continues to hamper the ongoing investment and growth. The monetary authority attempted to curb this macroeconomic instability. However, the monetary policy's speed of adjustment towards the long run equilibrium is about 2 percent per quarter and about 8 percent annually when there is a macroeconomic shock to the system. In order to have full adjustment, it could take many years. This exacerbated a daunting challenge for the sustained economic growth. For these reasons, it is not easy to tackle the macroeconomic instability within a short time (Zerayehu, 2006).

3. Literature Review

The concept of structural change represents a dynamic process of change in sectoral relative contributions to GDP in which the share of manufacturing in GDP rapidly increases. Such increase in the share of industry causes the agricultural share in GDP to decline concomitantly in a non-linear pattern. Amidst, the contribution of services in GDP begins to grow. This dynamic process continues until the share of manufacturing takes the leading position and contributes to GDP (Kuznets, 1966; Chenery and Taylor, 1968; Kongsamut *et al.*, 1997; and ECA 2011). Comparing with agriculture and service, industrializing the economy means moving towards higher productivity, higher earnings and profit, integrated industrial products, product sophistication and output diversification, relatively low risk (volatility and vulnerability), widen employment creation and so on. Enhancing total factor productivity in this regard is the central process of structural change and perpetual growth. Both theories and empirics indicate that factor accumulation of saving and investment should be considered as a necessary but not sufficient condition for sustaining economic growth and transformation (Todaro and Smith, 2011).

An alternative framework of factor productivity is then considered to complement the role of factor accumulation (William and Ross, 2001). It was Solow (1956) who first questioned the accumulationist view and then kicked off the debate that growth involves technical change. He found that seven-eighth of output growth attributed to TFP growth in his study. Following the exogenous growth model, the endogenous growth model pioneered by Romer's (1986) and Lucas' (1988) provides due emphasis on new knowledge (Grossman and Helpman, 1991), innovation (Aghion and Howitt, 1992) public infrastructure (Barro, 1990; Stephen, 2001) and the like. In general, the recent theories suggest that TFP in the sense of change in technology, knowledge, human capital and spillover effect drives the long-run growth while accumulation of factors does not explain long run growth. Some believed that technology-led productivity growth is the source of sustaining growth and transformation (Kuznets 1973; Schumpeter 1947 and Schultz 1964). Studies conducted by Hirschman (1958) and Johnston and Mellor (1961) give more emphasis on the role of linkages of the

economy. Many also pay attention to the roles of the market, and institutions (Matthews, 1986 and Rodrik, 2003), and low resource cost and enabling environment in economic transformation (Thaddee *et al.*, 2009).

Most developed countries experience in this regard shows a considerable portion of GDP growth can be explained by growth in TFP (Dollar and Sokoloff, 1990). However, some studies carried out by Easterly, Geda, and others reach at different conclusions. Easterly W. (2002) decomposes growth into TFP and capital deepening by employing the methodology of Klenow-Rodriguez-Clare. He finds that the permanent component growth over the period 1951-2001 is estimated around 0.48 percent, explained by TFP growth (0.59 percent) instead of capital deepening (0.08 percent). His study also posits most of the growth is due to non-agricultural sources despite the government's commitment to agricultural development led industrialization strategy. Geda and Degefe (2005) also investigate the same issue by considering education per worker as one the explanatory variable over the period 1960-2000 and employ Collins and Bosworth methodology. Unlike Easterly, they find that growth is explained by capital deepening, not by the growth rate of TFP. The growth in real GDP per worker is 0.73 percent on average over the reference period. Physical capital per worker in this regard accounts for 1.18 percent while TFP shows negative performance (0.63 percent). Education has better contributed to the growth of GDP per worker than the TFP does, reflecting the considerable role of human capital in terms of education in the Ethiopian economy.

As discussed earlier, TFP is the driving force of long run growth and has a permanent effect on structural change. It also generates an increasing return to scale and sources of efficiency as well as enhances the welfare of the society (Andres, 2007). Therefore, what are the chief determinants of change in TFP in order to articulate a sound economic policy? Both neoclassical and modern growth theories propose differently about the determinants of technological change. The neoclassical models consider technological progress as an exogenous variable like manna coming from heaven (Solow, 1956). However, the modern growth models explain the sources of technological change as an endogenous variable (Romer, 1990). This model takes endogenous knowledge creation as the principal determinant. The existence of new ideas and stock of ideas creates the dynamic process of economic transformation (Romer, 1990). From the theoretical perspective and empirical evidences, the best disaggregated determinants of TFP are: creation of knowledge and innovation; transfer of innovation; adoption and adaptation of innovation; and absorptive capacity (Anders, 2007).

Creation of knowledge and innovation about how to produce is the principal driving machine for perpetual economic growth and improvement in the wellbeing of the society by lowering unit cost of production, advances quality and efficiency. In effect, knowledge creation positively influences the TFP growth (Abdih and Joutz, 2005). Romer (1990) in this regard argues that the stock and the creation of

new knowledge through R&D are plenty as compared to any other resources with the assumption of increasing return to scale. However, R&D by itself is costly so that most developing countries could not afford it. As a result of this, the effect of R&D on the long run growth might be inconclusive in case of poor countries (Jones, 1995). Therefore, most countries acquire the state-of-the-art technology from countries which are leading in discoveries and idea creations through importation of knowledge intensive goods and service, and foreign direct investment (Mayer, 2001; Keller and Yeaple, 2003 and Torfenn and Jorn, 2005). However, the effects of both importation of knowledge intensive goods and FDI on TFP depends on the absorptive capacity and system of patent rights (Aitken and Harrison (1999). On top of these factors, the transfer and diffusion of technology heavily depend on the openness of the foreign trade and level of liberalization of the domestic trade, positively influence sectoral TFP growth (Khan, 2006; Nicoletti and Scarpetta, 2003 and Arnold, Javorcik, and Mattoo (2007).

Once the innovation is created domestically or imported from abroad, the next issue is how the recipients use the innovation. There are two possible ways taken by countries: adoption and adaption. Some use the innovation as it is (adoption) and some use it by customizing with their own existing environment (adaption). This also depends on the absorptive capacity of the recipients in order to scale up TFP growth (Nelson and Phelps, 1966). The impact of absorptive capacity on TFP also depends on stock of human capital in terms of education and health and infrastructural development (Benhabib and Spiegel, 1994; Isaksson, 2002; Nachega and Fontaine, 2006; Aschauer, 1989; Fan and Zhang; 2004 and Hulten, 1996). Apart from the aforementioned factors, macroeconomic stability has its own implication on the growth of TFP. Providing distinctive attention to developing countries, macroeconomic stability in general and inflation in particular are key factors in TFP growth. If it is stable, it has a positive influence on TFP growth. Otherwise, the inflationary condition could cause investment to be discouraged due to economic uncertainty, adversely affecting the TFP growth (Akinlo, 2005).

4. Methodology

The study uses sectoral growth accounting approach in order to estimate sectoral TFP growth. Using this estimate, the study employs VARX model so as to examine the determinants of sectoral TFP growth. The following subsections present all the details.

4.1. Sectoral Growth Accounting Approach

In understanding the different components and definitions of TFP, there are different types of estimation technique for sectoral TFP. The study, however, uses the growth accounting approach in order to reap the benefits derived from taking into account technological change, technical efficiency, allocative efficiency and scale effect dimension of TFP.

Abramovitz (1956) and Solow (1956) introduced TFP for the first time, which refined by Denison (1967). The residual factor in GDP growth rate captures the TFP, not explained by growth in capital, land and labour. According to this approach, there are two distinct sources of growth: input-driven (increasing factor accumulation) and TFP-driven (increasing factor productivity). The first one invokes the assumption of diminishing return to scale while the latter one invokes increasing return to scale.

Consider a Cobb-Douglas production function for each sector – agriculture, industry and service as presented by equation 1. Note that the model excludes agricultural land, N , through all equations for non-agricultural sectors.

$$Y = f(A, L, K, N) \quad (1)$$

Where Y denotes sectoral GDP, L stands for sectoral labour, K stands for sectoral capital stock, and N stands for agricultural land. 'A' also designates the sectoral TFP. The model assumes constant return to scale at sectoral level, which directly fits with the CGE model assumption. By differentiating both sides, equation 1 can be written as follows.

$$dY = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial A} \cdot dA + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial L} \cdot dL + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial K} \cdot dK + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial N} \cdot dN \quad (2)$$

Dividing the entire equation by Y yields the growth rate of sectoral GDP, i.e.

$$\frac{dY}{Y} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial A} \cdot \frac{dA}{Y} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial L} \cdot \frac{dL}{Y} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial K} \cdot \frac{dK}{Y} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial N} \cdot \frac{dN}{Y} \quad (3)$$

Manipulating equation 3 mathematically by multiplying the independent variables with A/A , L/L , and K/K as presented in equation 4. This helps to get factor income share in the coefficients.

$$\frac{dY}{Y} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial A} \cdot \frac{dA}{Y} \cdot \frac{A}{A} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial L} \cdot \frac{dL}{Y} \cdot \frac{L}{L} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial K} \cdot \frac{dK}{Y} \cdot \frac{K}{K} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial N} \cdot \frac{dN}{Y} \cdot \frac{N}{N} \quad (4)$$

Rearrange equation 4 and get equation 5

$$\frac{dY}{Y} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial A} \cdot \frac{A}{Y} \cdot \frac{dA}{A} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial L} \cdot \frac{L}{Y} \cdot \frac{dL}{L} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial K} \cdot \frac{K}{Y} \cdot \frac{dK}{K} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial N} \cdot \frac{N}{Y} \cdot \frac{dN}{N} \quad (5)$$

Letting $g_y = \frac{dY}{Y}$, $g_A = \frac{dA}{A}$, $g_L = \frac{dL}{L}$, $g_K = \frac{dK}{K}$, $g_N = \frac{dN}{N}$ permits construction of equation 6 as follows.

$$g_y = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial A} \cdot \frac{A}{Y} \cdot g_A + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial L} \cdot \frac{L}{Y} \cdot g_L + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial K} \cdot \frac{K}{Y} \cdot g_K + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial N} \cdot \frac{N}{Y} \cdot g_N \quad (6)$$

The term $\frac{\partial Y}{\partial A} \cdot \frac{A}{Y} = g_{TFP}$ is not directly observable and refers to as Solow residual or total factor productivity growth. This means that

$$g_y = g_{TFP} + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial L} \cdot \frac{L}{Y} \cdot g_L + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial K} \cdot \frac{K}{Y} \cdot g_K + \frac{\partial Y}{\partial N} \cdot \frac{N}{Y} \cdot g_N \quad (7)$$

The sectoral growth accounting approach imposes the assumptions of competitive markets and constant returns to scale in the context of neoclassical economics. This assumption implies that the coefficients that are the output elasticities are equal to the factor income share. As factors earn their marginal product in neoclassical economics, the marginal products of labour, capital and land are wage (w), capital rent (r) and land rent (z), respectively. Therefore, we can substitute $w = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial L}$, $r = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial K}$, $z = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial N}$ in the equation 7 and get the following equation that explains output growth in terms of factor income share.

$$g_y = g_{TFP} + w \cdot \frac{L}{Y} \cdot g_L + r \cdot \frac{K}{Y} \cdot g_K + z \cdot \frac{N}{Y} \cdot g_N \quad (8)$$

Looking at equation 8, the multiplication of marginal product and input ratio per output gives the factor income share out of total income. Mathematically, the parameter $\alpha = w \cdot \frac{L}{Y}$, $\beta = r \cdot \frac{K}{Y}$, $\gamma = z \cdot \frac{N}{Y}$ measure the factor income share of labour, capital and land respectively. Therefore, equation 8 can be rewritten as follows.

$$g_y = g_{TFP} + \alpha \cdot g_L + \beta \cdot g_K + \gamma \cdot g_N \quad (9)$$

Rearrange equation 9 to get the growth rate of TFP equation, lead to:

$$g_{TFP} = g_y - (\alpha \cdot g_L + \beta \cdot g_K + \gamma \cdot g_N) \quad (10)$$

The factor income shares are exogenous parameters. The study then picks up national income account of year 2006 in order to calculate the factor income share. This helps to have a consistent base with the SAM 2006 for CGE model. Note that such factor shares for each sector are almost similar with some countries experience¹. The following equations give a complete specification for each sector.

For the agricultural sector:

$$g_{TFP} = g_y - (0.0754g_L + 0.102g_K + 0.144g_N) \quad (11)$$

For the industry:

$$g_{TFP} = g_y - (0.3405g_L + 0.6595g_K) \quad (12)$$

For the services: -

$$g_{TFP} = g_y - (0.23g_L + 0.77g_K) \quad (13)$$

4.2. Specification of the VARX Model

Using the estimates of the sectoral TFP growth from the growth accounting approach, the study specifies the determinants of sectoral TFP. The broad source of the TFP growth is innovation (knowledge creation) in a domestic economy and technology transfer (absorption and transmission of knowledge) from abroad. We present this in equation 14 presents as follows.

$$g_{TFP} = f(\text{innovation, technology transfer}) \quad (14)$$

Many studies show that research and development (R&D) serve as a proxy for knowledge creation and point out its long relationship with the TFP growth rate (Chen and Dahlman, 2004). Research conducted by Alston, Norton and Pardey (1998) also indicates the long-lasting impact of R&D on TFP in the long run. Therefore, equation 14 can be rewritten as:

$$g_{TFP} = f(R\&D, \text{technology transfer}) \quad (15)$$

The world technology frontier, moreover, provides positive externalities and spillover effects to individual country in order to fill the technology gap through importation of technology (Keller and Yeaple, 2003; Mayer, 2001). Such channels, in turn, depend on technology transfer barriers. Thus, equation 15 can be extended to the following equation by taking into account importation of capital goods and transfer barriers.

$$g_{TFP} = f(R\&D, \text{imported capital goods, technology transfer barriers}) \quad (16)$$

A barrier to technology transfer reduces the absorption of technology from the world frontier and shrinks the TFP growth rate. This repercussion ranges from slowing down the pace of transfer to blocking technology adoption (Ngai, 2004). Trade barriers and capacity barriers are worth mentioning in this regard so that equation 16 can be written as follow.

$$g_{TFP} = f(R\&D, \text{imported capital goods, trade barriers, capacity barriers}) \quad (17)$$

In most developing countries, capacity and trade barrier is broadly explained in terms of openness of the economy and service trade liberalization in order to addressing the limitations associated with both external economy and domestic economy, respectively. The existence of limited openness of the economy is the main challenge in encouraging the inflow of technology and thereby productivity growth. On top of this foreign trade, domestic service trade restriction causes poor productivity and slows down economic growth overtime (Asghar, 2007). Equation 18 gives the extended one by decomposing trade barriers into openness and service trade liberalization index as presented in the following way.

¹ Many studies assume a constant labor share ranging from 0.55 to 0.7 on average. Bosworth *et al.* (2007) indicate that a capital share of 0.4 for the industry and services as well as the factor shares in agriculture sector are 0.5, 0.25, and 0.25 for labor, capital and land, respectively. Rubina V. (2008) in this regard calculates labour shares of 0.58, 0.54 and 0.56 for agriculture, industry and service respectively in India. He calculates a capital share of 0.22, 0.55, and 0.44 to the corresponding sectors as well as a land share of 0.20 for the agriculture. He also undertakes the GTAP factor share estimation, as reported by Terry Roe, in which capital accounts for 0.61 and 0.50 for industry and services, respectively. The labour shares are 0.39 and 0.50 for the corresponding sectors. The GTAP estimates also show shares of 0.58, 0.54 and 0.56 for labour, capital and land in agricultural sector (Thomas and Marinos, 2010). These evidences reflect that our assumption of factor share for Ethiopian economy is fair.

$$g_{TFP} = f(R \& D, \text{imported capital goods, openness}, \text{service trade liberalization, capacity barriers}) \quad (18)$$

The level of human capital and infrastructural development can address the constraints associated with the innovative and absorptive capacity (Nelson and Phelps, 1966; Benhabib and Spiegel, 1994 and Easterly and Rebelo, 1993). Both primary school enrollment and road network human capital are proxy variables for human capital and infrastructural development, respectively. Therefore, equation 18 can be extended as follow.

$$g_{TFP} = f(R \& D, \text{imported capital goods, openness}, \text{service trade liberalization, human capital, infrastructure}) \quad (19)$$

On top of the specified determinants, the stability of macroeconomic performance has its own implication on the TFP growth. The study, therefore, incorporates inflation rate as a proxy variable for the stability of macroeconomic performance. Therefore, equation 20 presented below gives the final model of TFP at the aggregate level.

$$g_{TFP} = f(R \& D, \text{imported capital goods, openness, service trade liberalization}, \text{human capital, infrastructure, inflation}) \quad (20)$$

On the basis of this aggregate TFP growth model, the study then drives sectoral TFP growth models for the agriculture, industry and services by allowing the interactions of sectoral TFP among the three sectors. This makes the model to have two broad components such as dependent interactive variables and exogenous variables. Such incorporation of sectoral interaction in the model claims the VARX model. The VARX model refers to a VAR that contains dependent variables that interact with each other and the exogenous variables. This allows the lag values of the sectoral TFP growths in order to build the model of sectoral productivity dynamics.

Considering the lack of data on R & D for the entire economy, the study takes into account only agricultural R & D. On the same note, the study takes the number of enrolled pupils in primary education and road network as proxy variables for human capital and infrastructure, respectively. The ratio of private credit to GDP is also considered as a continuous proxy variable for service trade liberalization index. A high ratio means that the economy is more liberalized, which is a lower ratio indicates the existence of more trade restriction in the economy.

Following the growth accounting approach that gives TFP in terms of growth rate, the study, therefore, considers explanatory variables in terms of growth rates so as to be uniform with TFP and for having robust diagnostic tests. Therefore, the final VARX model for each sector is presented as below.

For the agriculture:

$$g_{TFPA} = f(g_{LTFPA}, g_{LTFPI}, g_{LTFPS}, g_{ard}, g_{imc}, g_{pep}, g_{nwr}, opp, lr, inf) \quad (21)$$

For the industry:

$$g_{TFPI} = f(g_{LTFPA}, g_{LTFPI}, g_{LTFPS}, g_{ard}, g_{imc}, g_{pep}, g_{nwr}, opp, lr, inf) \quad (22)$$

For the service:

$$g_{TFPS} = f(g_{LTFPA}, g_{LTFPI}, g_{LTFPS}, g_{ard}, g_{imc}, g_{pep}, g_{nwr}, opp, lr, inf) \quad (23)$$

Where g_{TFPA} = TFP growth rate for agriculture; g_{TFPI} = TFP growth rate for industry; g_{TFPS} = TFP growth rate for service; g_{LTFPA} = lag values of TFP growth rate for agriculture; g_{LTFPI} = lag value of growth rate for industry; g_{LTFPS} = lag value of growth rate for service; g_{ard} = growth rate of government expenditure for agricultural R&D ; g_{pep} = growth rate of pupils in primary school; g_{nwr} = growth rate of road networks in kilometers ; opp = openness of the economy; lr = service trade liberalization index; inf = inflation

Note that the VARX model has a comparative advantage over the VAR model. The VAR model consists of all dependent variables and is used for forecasting purpose whereas the VARX model contains both dependant (endogenous) variables and exogenous variables included in the model allows articulation of policy prescription too.

4.3. Unit Root Test with Structural Breaks

The ADF test is often applicable in detecting the existence of stationarity in a time series with the assumption of no structural break. However, neglecting the issues of structural breaks leads to biased results and lessens the possibility of rejecting a bogus unit root (Perron, 1989). The study, thus, considers endogenous structural breaks in the time series data. This helps to detect the exact nature of stationarity of time series, and to know the year when the structural break is in time series. Zivot and Andrews (1992) test and Clemete, Montanes, and Reyes (1998) test are widely applicable in cases of single break and two-breaks, respectively.

The Zivot and Andrews (ZA) model considers one structural break and uses many dummy variables for each structural break year. As the exact endogenous break is unknown, the ZA model then assumes every point as a potential break. It, therefore, sequentially conducts a regression for every structural break point, in which the minimum t-statistic indicates where the endogenous structural break date is. The following equation gives the ZA model.

$$y_t = \alpha + \beta t + \gamma DU1_t + \omega DT1_t + \mu y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda \Delta y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (24)$$

$$DU_{1t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ and } DT_{1t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Whereas y_t is a time series variable, t is the time trend, DU_{1t} is the intercept dummy variable indicating mean shift (change in the level), DT_{1t} stands for the slope dummy representing change in the slope of the trend function. Besides, T_B represents a potential break point, k denotes lag length.

The null hypothesis states that the time series that excludes any structural break is non-stationary whereas the alternative hypothesis indicates that the series that includes one structural break is stationary. The Clemete, Montanes and Reyes (1998) model, on the other hand, test stationarity in the presence of two breaks in the time series. They propose two models: - Additive outlier (AO) model and Innovative outlier (IO) model in order to address instantaneous structural break and gradual change, respectively.

The following equation gives the IO model as below.

$$y_t = \alpha + \beta y_{t-1} + \delta_1 DT_{1t} + \delta_2 DT_{2t} + \omega_{1t} DU_{1t} + \omega_{2t} DU_{2t} + \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (25)$$

$$DU_{1t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad DU_{2t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for representing intercept dummy}$$

$$DT_{1t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad DT_{2t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for representing the slope dummy}$$

The AO model, moreover, has two stages in order to test for stationarity. The first step removes the deterministic part of the variable by modeling:

$$y_t = \alpha + \omega_{1t} DU_{1t} + \omega_{2t} DU_{2t} + \bar{y}_t \quad (26)$$

In the second step, the study uses the following model in order to test.

$$\bar{y}_t = \rho \bar{y}_{t-1} + \omega_{1t} DT_{1t-i} + \omega_{2t} DT_{2t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \bar{\Delta y}_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (27)$$

Where

$$DU_{1t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad DU_{2t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for representing intercept dummy}$$

$$DT_{1t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad DT_{2t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > T_B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for representing the slope dummy}$$

Note that the endogenous structural break test has a comparative advantage on ADF test and exogenous structural

break test. It considers structural break which the ADF test does not take into account. Besides, the endogenous structural break test considers the response of policy changes and lags structure whereas the exogenous structural break test does not consider them.

4.4. Data Source

Data for sectoral real GDP, spending on the agricultural R&D, inflation rate, openness, imported capital goods, private credit per GDP, road network, and cultivated land and data for a number of pupils enrolled at primary school are collected from the World Bank, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, National Bank of Ethiopia, United Nation Conference on Trade and Development, and Ethiopian Economic Association.

As there is not disaggregated data for sectoral gross capital formation and labour force, we decompose the number of labors in non-agricultural sector into industrial labour and service labour based on the share of employment rates of 33 percent in the industry and 67 percent in service. The Labour survey in 2005 referred for confirmation. We also decompose the aggregated gross capital formation into sectoral level using the sectoral share of public expenditure. This is because of the fact that the government expenditure has the same fashion with gross capital formation. Besides, it is the key contributor of gross capital formation.

5. Empirical Results and Analysis

As described earlier, sectoral growth accounting approach produces the estimates of TFP growth rates for agriculture, industry and services. Using the estimates of sectoral TFPs, the VARX model that considers both sectoral interaction and exogenous variables identifies the powerful determinants of sectoral TFP growth.

5.1. Estimates of Sectoral TFP Growths

Both empirical and theoretical evidences show that economic growth can be decomposed into factor accumulation and factor productivity. The Ethiopian economy in this regard manifests a multifaceted performance depending on the political economic policy regimes such as the feudal-capitalism (1940 to 1974), socialism (1975-1988), mixed economy (1989-1991), more of liberalization (1992-2000) and pro-poor growth regime (2000 to date) as presented in Table 2. The empirical results indicate that the accumulation of labour factor is the dominant source of growth in agriculture sector over the period 1972-2010. Both capital and land positively contribute to the average growth rate of agriculture. However, agricultural TFP growth rate negatively contribute and explain the stochastic sectoral growth rate on average in 1972-2010. Following pro-poor economic policy shift, the agricultural TFP growth takes the lead in positively influencing the agricultural growth during 2001-2011. This might be because of the pro-poor growth strategy that addresses the rural-poor that are heavily

engaged in agriculture sector. Accumulation of capital dominates the growth rate of industry value-added in the same reference period, followed by labour contribution. The TFP growth remains negative as manifested in agriculture sector. During the period 1992-2000, the industrial TFP growth positively contributes and takes the lead in the contribution to growth rate of industry value-added. This is

mainly due to the fact that many industrial firms were encouraged as the economy was free from the bondage of socialism in 1991. In service sector, the contribution of capital to service value-added is dominant during the socialist and liberalization regimes while the TFP growth dominantly influences the service value-added during 1972-1974 and 1989-1991.

Table 2. Sectoral TFP growth rates Using Sectoral Growth Accounting Approach

Sectoral Decomposition of GDP Growth Rate	Political economy regimes*					Average 1972-2011
	1972-1974	1975-1988	1989-1991	1992-2000	2001-2011**	
Agricultural GDP growth rate	1.5	1.0	3.4	1.6	7.1	3.1
Contribution of labour	1.4	2.3	2.7	2.1	2.1	2.2
Contribution of land	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	1.0	0.5	0.3
Contribution of capital	1.7	1.6	0.9	0.3	1.4	1.2
TFPG-Agriculture	-1.7	-2.7	-0.1	-1.7	3.2	-0.6
Industrial GDP growth rate	5.2	4.1	-6.3	4.1	9.7	4.9
Contribution of labour	1.2	0.8	1.0	0.3	2.2	1.1
Contribution of capital	19.2	25.9	-6.1	-3.8	22.9	15.5
TFPG-Industry	-15.3	-22.6	-1.3	7.7	-15.4	-11.7
Service GDP growth rate	5.5	3.9	2.7	4.2	10.7	5.9
Contribution of labour	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.2	1.5	0.8
Contribution of capital	2.1	8.6	-13.1	14.6	12.3	8.8
TFPG-Service	2.6	-5.2	15.1	-10.6	-3.0	-3.7

Source:-Author's own calculation based on sectoral growth accounting approach.

*Note that Ethiopia passes through different political economy regimes-feudal-capitalism in 1940-1974, socialism in 1975-1988, mixed economy in 1989-1991, more of liberalization in 1992-2000, and pro-poor growth regime in 2001-2011.

**Data for sectoral GDP are collected on the basis of the government report that states 11 percent GDP growth rate, on average, in 2005-2011. This figure is not shared by independent bodies.

In a nutshell, the sources of economic growth vary with major economic sectors and policy regimes. Labour is the dominant source of agricultural growth while capital deepening is the big source of growth in industry and services, regardless of the various political economy regimes. However, sectoral TFP growths negatively contribute the growth rate of each sector over the period 1972-2010. This negative growth rate possibly reflects the lack of efficiency and the technological change in economy. In addition, the sectoral TFP growth rates are highly fluctuating overtime and across sectors in the entire period. The main finding is that the Ethiopia economy is explained by factor accumulation, not factor productivity in the reference period. By implication, the stochastic trend in sectoral TFP and the average negative TFP growth explain the erratic economic growth rate. Therefore, such TFP growth is the bottleneck to long run growth and structural change, creating severe economic debacles and a deadlock situation.

Pertaining to the dynamics of sectoral TFP growth rate, Figure 1 shows that the growth rate of TFP in agriculture, industry and service moves stochastically around zero overtime. However, the fluctuation varies across sectors. In the case of agriculture, the dynamics of TFP growth rate seems less swinging as compared to the other two sectors. The growth path of the industrial TFP highly fluctuates across time with some outliers. Such variations indicate that factors that are heavily responsible for variations are likely to be different per each sector.




Figure 1. The Dynamics of Sectoral TFP growth rate in 1970-2011

Source:-Author's own calculation, estimated using sectoral growth accounting approach

5.2. Analyzing the Determinants of Sectoral TFP Growths

Using the estimates of TFP growths for agriculture, industry and service sector, the study specifies, estimates, and analyzes the driving forces and enablers of sectoral TFP growth using VARX model. Hence, the empirical results of descriptive analysis, optimal lag length, stationarity test, regression outcomes, diagnostic test, impulse response function, and variance decomposition are presented as follows.

5.3. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis gives the general features of data and emphasizes how it looks like the distribution of time series.

Table 3 below presents both central tendency and variation measures of the distribution of the data over the period 1972-2011. The average value or the mean value of the sectoral TFP growth for the three sectors is negative, indicating how the sectoral TFP growths can be a daunting challenge for

economic transformation and sustainable growth. All variables in the VARX model have a wide range of dispersion around the mean with a mix of positive and negative skewness and peakedness.

Table 3. Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min	Max
TFPGA	40	-.005	.081	0.006	-0.81	4.73	-.274	.182
TFPGI	40	-.116	.487	0.23	-1.91	7.55	-2.04	.64
TFPGS	40	-.037	.246	0.06	-1.73	6.12	-.884	.317
GARD	40	.170	.470	0.22	1.69	6.61	-.627	1.77
GRNW	40	.046	.0479	0.002	0.72	3.94	-.0502	.172
GIMC	40	.058	.366	0.13	-0.37	3.26	-.99	.724
GPEP	40	.083	.104	0.10	-0.04	2.79	-.163	.315
OPP	40	28.35	10.62	112.95	0.56	2.21	11.73	51.53
IR	40	15.73	5.61	31.51	0.14	1.56	6.15	24.65
INF	40	9.25	11.29	127.53	1.11	4.64	-9.81	44.4

Source:-Author's Estimation

TFPGA stands for TFP growth rate for agriculture; TFPGI stands for TFP growth rate for industry; TFPGS for TFP growth rate for service; GARD denotes growth rate of government expenditure for agricultural R&D, GIMC denotes growth rate of imported capital goods ,GPEP denotes growth rate of pupil in primary school; GRNW stands for growth rate of road net works in kilometers ;*opp* stands for openness of the economy; LR denotes service trade liberalization index and INF for inflation.

With these descriptive statistics, the variables show some fashion of statistical relationship among themselves as captured by the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Table 4). This coefficient is symmetric and explains the association ship between and interdependence of two variables without any a priori assumption. Note that regression analysis reflects the dependence of explanatory variable on a response variable, capturing unilateral effect only.

Table 4. The Pearson Correlation and Statistical Relationship

	TFPGA	TFPGI	TFPGS	GARD	GRNW	GIMC	GPEP	OPP	IR	INF
TFPGA	1.0000									
TFPGI	-0.0879	1.0000								
TFPGS	-0.0542	0.0944	1.0000							
GARD	-0.2755	0.1548	-0.5013	1.0000						
GRNW	-0.0797	0.0437	-0.1335	0.1403	1.0000					
GIMC	0.1076	0.3566	-0.0392	0.1474	0.1809	1.0000				
GPEP	0.1802	-0.0419	-0.1984	0.0172	0.3357	0.3162	1.0000			
OPP	0.2865	-0.0920	-0.0829	-0.0466	0.2734	0.1623	0.3070	1.0000		
IR	0.1019	0.0897	0.1684	0.1348	-0.0193	-0.0382	0.0811	0.6352	1.0000	
INF	-0.2160	0.0127	0.1012	-0.1428	0.0287	0.0052	-0.2103	0.1262	0.0630	1.0000

Source:-Author's Estimation

5.4. Optimal Order of Lag

The optimal number of lags is important for appropriateness of the model and determines the statistically significance level of explanatory variables and the forecasts. Table 5 gives alternative techniques of Akaike Information criterion (AIC); Schwarz Bayesian criterion (BIC), Hannan-Quinn criterion (HQC) and the log likelihood ratio (LR).

Table 5. Selection of the Optimal Lag Length

lags	LR	p(LR)	AIC	BIC	HQC
1	50.64228		-0.813460	0.770059	-0.260769
2	68.99877	0.00003	-1.333265*	0.646134*	-0.642402*
3	73.30875	0.47307	-1.072708	1.302570	-0.243672
4	77.37432	0.52099	-0.798573	1.972585	0.168635

Source:-Author's estimates

The log likelihood ratio suggests the order of lag is 2 as the probability of LR is small compared to the 5 percent level of significance. This is also confirmed by the AIC, BIC and HQC. Therefore, the paper uses an optimal lag length of 2 for testing stationarity of the time series and estimating the VARX model.

5.5. Unit Root Test

Most empirical evidences that exhibit stationary for ratio time series provide a suspect of the existence of structural break that affects the pattern of time series of the two variables. Besides, the unparalleled political economic shifts in Ethiopia in 1970-2011 cause the economy to have a structural break that affects the pattern of time series, calling for Zivot-Andrews and Clemente-Montanes-Reyes unit-root test. Unlike ADF test assumes no structural beak in a given

time series data, the Zivot-Andrews unit root test assumes one structural break whereas Clemente-Montanes-Reyes unit-root test accounts for two structural breaks in a given time series. The latter two believes that structural break does

have a permanent effect, not transitory effect, in the patter of time series.

5.6. Zivot-Andrews Unit Root Test for Allowing for One Break

Table 6. Zivot-Andrews unit root test for allowing for a break in intercept

Variables	Break year	Minimum t-statistics	Critical Values	
			1% level of significance	5% level of significance
TFPGA	2004	-7.401*	-5.43	-4.80
TFPGI	1985	-5.555*	-5.43	-4.80
TFPGS	1993	-7.896*	-5.43	-4.80
GARD	1998	-6.543*	-5.43	-4.80
GIMC	1994	-7.290*	-5.43	-4.80
GPEP	1994	5.841*	-5.43	-4.80
GRNW	1994	-7.142*	-5.43	-4.80
INF	2005	-3.357	-5.43	-4.80
OPP	1994	-2.839	-5.43	-4.80
LR	1996	-3.751	-5.43	-4.80

Source:-Author's estimation

Table 6 provides the Zivot-Andrews unit root test for all variables. Except inflation rate, all the variables explained by the growth rates are stationary at 5% level of significance. Inflation rate is non-stationary even in the case of one structural beak assumption. Both openness and liberalization index remain non-stationary despite one structural break.

One of the interesting points in this test is that the year chosen for structural break for each variable is not uniform. Except the industrial TFP growth, all variables in the VARX model show the existence of endogenous structural break in the post-liberalization period (after 1992). Though the government is committed to liberalize the economy in 1992, it does not fully liberalization the market and some sectors of the economy remain as they were. Moreover, some of the variables did not respond out-rightly to the structural adjustment policy and a series of economic policy reforms. The time series data for private credit per GDP indicates that the break year is 1996 as the first private bank started working in the post liberalization. Inflation rate also has a structural break in 2005. This is mainly due to the fact that the government successively runs extensive public expenditure and depletion of the foreign currency resource following election 2005 disputes and a paradigm shift towards state-led development program. The graphical presentation for the ZA test is presented in annex 1.

5.7. Clemente-Montanes-Reyes Unit-Root Test for Two Breaks with AO and IO Models

The ZA test points out that inflation rate, openness, and index of liberalization are non-stationary in the existence of one structural break. This claims the CMR unit-root test that enables to examine the stationarity condition in the existence of two structural breaks in a time series data for both additive outlier (AO) and innovation outlier (IO). Table 7 gives details.

Table 7. Clemente-Montanes-Reyes unit-root test with double mean shifts, AO and IO model

Variable	Additive Outlier (AO)		Innovational Outlier (IO)	
	Min t	Optimal Breakpoints	Min t	Optimal Breakpoints
inf	-8.195*	1979 & 2004	-6.269*	1978 & 2006
opp	-3.681	1995 & 2001	-5.645*	1986 & 1991
lr	-6.807*	1976 & 1997	-3.372	1991 & 1994

Source: Author's Estimation

N.B:- Min. 't' is the minimum t-statistics calculated. 5% critical value for the two breaks; -5.490

The AO assumes a rapid structural break by which both inflation rate and liberalization index are stationary. However, openness is not stationary in the assumption of a rapid break in slope. Interestingly, it becomes stationary in the case of innovation outlier (IO) that considers a gradual structural break. This indicates that openness of the economy shows the existence of a gradual structural change than a rapid structural change. Finally, all variables that expressed in terms of growth rate and ratio are stationary when the study considers structural break using by ZA unit root test and its complement, the CMR unit root test. The graphical presentation for the CMR test is presented in annex 2.

5.8. Regression Results and Analysis for VARX Model

At the optimal lag order of 2, the OLS estimates for the VARX system using the data 1972-2011 are presented below in the following three equations. The inclusion of addition information of exogenous variables in the VAR model contributes for a better trend predictability compared with the simple VAR model.

The first equation in the VARX system indicates there is a strong sectoral TFP interaction of the industry and service with the agriculture at different lags (Table 8). The lagged

values of sectoral TFP growth are statistically significant at different lags for each sector, reflecting different lag structure matters differently for the sectoral impacts of agriculture TFP. Exceptionally, it is only agricultural and service TFP growth rates at lag 1 that have a positive impact on the current period of agricultural TFP growth, mirroring service sector as the leading consumer of the agricultural products and thereby creates a massive demand for the sector. Thus, the higher growth of service TFP stimulates agriculture to enhance productivity. Looking at the lags, all sectoral TFP growths have positive impacts at lag-1 and negative impacts at lag-2 on the current period agricultural TFP growth. Such inconsistent relationships reveal the existence of erratic TFP growth rates across sectors and overtimes, leaving the envisaged sustainable economic growth with an inherent challenge.

Table 8. Equation for the agricultural TFP with Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

Variables	coefficient	std. error	t-ratio	p-value
const	-0.0391166	0.0277652	-1.409	0.1717
tfpga_1	0.226065	0.130303	1.735	0.0956 *
tfpga_2	-0.426641	0.145727	-2.928	0.0074 ***
tfpgi_1	0.0223727	0.0251977	0.8879	0.3834
tfpgi_2	-0.0513581	0.0184041	-2.791	0.0101 **
tfpgs_1	0.133646	0.0505163	2.646	0.0142 **
tfpgs_2	-0.0376304	0.0425246	-0.8849	0.3850
gard	-0.0768301	0.0287418	-2.673	0.0133 **
grnw	-0.174601	0.261843	-0.6668	0.5113
gimc	0.0392750	0.0215664	1.821	0.0811 *
gpep	-0.00730330	0.0909797	-0.08027	0.9367
inf	-0.00114779	0.00101903	-1.126	0.2712
opp	0.00336982	0.00151023	2.231	0.0353 **
lr	-0.00238199	0.00273760	-0.8701	0.3929

Source: Author's estimates

Apart from sectoral TFP growths, the other statistically significant explanatory variables are government expenditure on agricultural R&D, imported capital goods and service, and openness of the economy. As can be seen from Table 8, the growth rate of government expenditure on R&D is statistically significant and has a negative impact on agricultural TFP growth. This does not mean that R&D, which is a proxy variable for technological innovation, adversely affects the agricultural TFP growth. It rather means that the government might not be able to utilize this public resource efficiently and productively for R&D activities. Among other factors, the existence of low investment in agricultural R&D along with negative growth rates in above one-third of the study period causes a negative implication for sectoral TFP. Except in the case of industry, the correlation statistics also point at the existence of a negative correlation between the growth rate of agricultural R&D and TFP growth in agricultural and service sectors. Unlike developed economies, the payoffs from the agricultural R&D are negligible and constrained by the lack of sound intellectual property rights, low human capital development, and the inexistence of a strong link between research outputs and practical activities.

Openness to international trade, on the other hand, positively influences the agricultural TFP growth. This implies that it allows the economy to acquire advanced technologies and intermediate capital that scale up the production capacity efficiently. It also exposes the economy to the intensively competitive and sizable market that sharpens the exported agricultural products to fit with international standard. Thus, such wide opportunity for acquisition and exposition causes the agricultural TFP to grow more and positively influence the growth rate of the sector, creating a fertile ground for agricultural technology transfer from abroad. Understanding the structure of trade and GDP in the study period, agricultural products account for the lion's share in the export market so that widening the agriculture sector to the international market provides an opportunity of increasing the sector TFP growth. The importation of capital goods including fertilizers, agricultural machineries, chemicals, and other technologies puts on positive influences on the agricultural TFP growth, reflecting technology transfer through importation of capital goods is a decisive factor that is responsible for structural change process via TFP. However, the low human capital development negatively affects the TFP growth and technology diffusion.

In a nutshell, the expenditure on agricultural R&D for technology innovation cannot be an alternative way for enhancing the TFP as R&D requires immense and expensive investment so that the country is unable to do so. Rather, technology transfer from abroad in terms of importation of capital goods has a positive implication for TFP growth. This shed some light that technology transfer is preferable as compared to technology innovation. This is mainly attributed to the lower unit cost of technology in the case of technology transfer comparing with innovation in the case of Ethiopia.

The second equation in the VARX system explains the determinants of industrial TFP growth (Table 9). It is only the growth rate of imported capital goods and service that has a strong relationship with industrial TFP growth. This means that technology transfer in terms of importation of capital goods and service is the chief source of industrial TFP growth, instead of technological innovation proxied by R&D. Most of the manufacturing industries in Ethiopia require a surge of advanced imported technologies of machineries, metals and the like.

Unlike the first equation, agricultural and service TFPs are not statistically significant to the current growth rate of industrial TFP growth, attributing to the existence of poor performance and scanty share of manufacturing in GDP. Note that the share of manufacturing accounted for only nearly 4.5 percent of GDP in the study period. This also reflects the fact that industry sector in Ethiopia is not in a position of being the power house and driver of innovation, allowing the share of agriculture in GDP to reduce while that of the services concomitantly increases.

Most R&D activities and technology creation occur in developed countries. Only that marginal share of these activities belongs to developing countries. Therefore, most of

the poor countries like Ethiopian opt to import and diffuse technology in terms of capital goods and service towards industrial sector. This benefit is generated from the R&D activities in developed countries and then spread to the domestic economy of Ethiopia through imports of capital goods and service. This improves the existing manufacturing techniques and develops advanced products that enhance economic growth.

Table 9. Equation for the industrial TFP with Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

Variables	coefficient	std. error	t-ratio	p-value
const	-0.185540	0.233255	-0.7954	0.4342
TFPGA_1	-0.609601	0.728661	-0.8366	0.4111
TFPGA_2	-0.112920	0.950747	-0.1188	0.9064
TFPGI_1	0.141439	0.250223	0.5653	0.5771
TFPGI_2	-0.161042	0.200483	-0.8033	0.4297
TFPGS_1	0.0327591	0.323906	0.1011	0.9203
TFPGS_2	0.301932	0.274486	1.100	0.2822
GARD	-0.0511189	0.172789	-0.2958	0.7699
GRNW	1.42159	3.28087	0.4333	0.6687
GIMC	0.535041	0.258871	2.067	0.0497 **
GPEP	-0.189120	0.803942	-0.2352	0.8160
INF	0.000256301	0.00582208	0.04402	0.9653
OPP	-0.0202679	0.0210487	-0.9629	0.3452
IR	0.0373625	0.0309338	1.208	0.2389

Source: Author's estimation

Equation 3 in the VARX system explains about the determinants of service TFP growth (Table 10). In sectoral interactions, there are no lagged values of sectoral TFP growth that are statistically significant in the model. The TFP growths for both industry and agriculture have positive impacts at lag 2 and negative impact at lag 1. Besides, the lagged values of service TFP have a negative relationship with the current growth rate of service TFP.

Table 10. Equation for service TFP with Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors

Variables	coefficient	std. error	t-ratio	p-value
const	-0.0531573	0.128952	-0.4122	0.6838
TFPGA_1	-0.0928793	0.375716	-0.2472	0.8069
TFPGA_2	0.368335	0.356431	1.033	0.3117
TFPGI_1	-0.0190266	0.0574678	-0.3311	0.7435
TFPGI_2	0.0146389	0.0668758	0.2189	0.8286
TFPGS_1	-0.264068	0.193095	-1.368	0.1841
TFPGS_2	-0.241372	0.167465	-1.441	0.1624
GARD	-0.305120	0.0725031	-4.208	0.0003 ***
GRNW	0.202089	0.492782	0.4101	0.6854
GIMC	0.0761891	0.0911215	0.8361	0.4113
GPEP	-0.351061	0.428494	-0.8193	0.4207
INF	0.000344785	0.00340992	0.1011	0.9203
OPP	-0.0167168	0.00621506	-2.690	0.0128 **
IR	0.0349581	0.0138799	2.519	0.0189 **

Source:-Author's estimation

Apart from such sectoral interactions, the growth rate of expenditure on agricultural R&D and openness are statistically significant and have a negative implication on service TFP growth rate. An inefficient utilization of public resource that channeled towards R&D causes this negative

relationship as it is also confirmed by the correlation statistics. However, the causative factors that are responsible for the negativity of openness on service TFP growth may be attributed to the lack of ability to absorb the technology spillovers and externalities derived from openness due to the country's technological and institutional incapability in service sectors. The negative impact of openness might also attribute to its transitory impacts, instead of permanent impacts as shown in several developing countries and technological and institutional incapability of the sector to utilize and reap the benefits derived from openness. In addition, the nature of the services sector is dominated by the hotel and restaurant, domestic trade and the like. This means that the service in Ethiopia characterized by the traditional activities, much away from technology and ICT. This service composition does not allow the sector to generate a positive relationship between openness and service TFP growth in the study period.

An index that measures the extent of liberalization in service trade is statistically significant and has a positive relationship with service TFP growth. When the service trade is being liberalized by increasing the participation of private investors, it surges up the TFP growth in the service sector. Therefore, the service TFP growth requires lesser service trade restriction and regulation for both domestic and foreign investment. In this regard, the financial development in general and private credit per GDP in particular is relevant for increasing the service TFP. The government, therefore, should attempt a series of economic policy reforms that allow the economy to be activated and creates a vibrant conducive investment environment. However, there are still many restrictions and regulations that retard the service sector. For instance, the government policy does not allow foreigners to invest in the financial sector even though the government launched liberalization and structural adjustment program since 1991. Taking a positive relationship between service TFP growth and index of liberalization in terms of private credit, the service sector has untapped potential of increasing the service TFP by liberalizing the service trade more in the case of Ethiopia.

To recapitulate, the statistically significant determinants of the sectoral TFP vary from sector to sector. Widening the openness of the economy, increasing imported capital goods, and liberalization are the crucial determinants of the sectoral TFP growth in agriculture, industry and services, respectively. Besides, the impact of technology transfer generates better outcomes comparing with the technology innovation, mainly due to the fact associated with innovation like inefficiency and expensiveness.

5.9. Diagnostic Test

No research can conclude the results of regression analysis without considering a range of diagnostic tests for heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation, normality, goodness-to-fit and the like. The diagnostic tests assist to detect the inadequacy of the model and identify the strengths and weakness of the model. They also reduce the probability of

wrongly rejecting or accepting the null hypothesis. In general, the diagnostic tests minimize the drawbacks by indicating problems associated with it. Table 11 gives the summary of the diagnostic tests.

VAR system, lag order 2
 OLS estimates, observations 1974-2011 (T = 38)
 Determinant of the covariance matrix = 7.552551e-006;
 Log-likelihood = 62.319886

Table 11. Summary of Diagnostic Tests

Particular	Assumptions	Tests	Distribution & Values	Remarks
For the VAR as a whole	Normality	Jarque-Bera test	Chi-square=16.834 (0.00991)	Reject Ho
	Normality	Doornik-Hansen test	Chi-square(6) = 27.588 [0.0001]	Reject Ho
	Goodness to fit	Likelihood ratio test	Chi-square(9) = 26.4502 [0.0017]	Reject Ho
	Autocorrelation	Portmanteau test	LB(9) = 80.7407 [0.0654]	Accept Ho
For Agricultural TFP equation	Goodness to fit	F-test	R-squared 0.693306 ; Adjusted R-squared 0.527181 F(13, 24) .053240 ; P-value(F) 0.001489	Reject Ho
	Normality	Jarque-Bera test	chi2 = 5.085 (0.07866)	Accept Ho
	Autocorrelation	Durbin-Watson test	rho -0.035449 Durbin-Watson 2.055865	Accept Ho
For industry TFP equation	Goodness to fit	F-test	R-squared 0.320062 Adjusted R-squared -0.048238 F(13, 24) .877320 P-value(F) 0.584948	Accept Ho
	Normality	Jarque-Bera test	chi2 = 10.327 (0.00572)	Reject Ho
	Autocorrelation	Durbin-Watson test	rho -0.044372 Durbin-Watson 1.988101	Accept Ho
For Service TFP growth	Goodness to fit	F-test	R-squared 0.621293 Adjusted R-squared 0.416160 F(13, 24) .261640 P-value(F) 0.000058	Reject Ho
	Normality	Jarque-Bera test	chi2 = 6.281 (0.04327)	Reject Ho
	Autocorrelation	Durbin-Watson test	rho -0.088418 Durbin-Watson 2.131882	Accept Ho

Source:-Author's Estimation

N.B:- The null hypothesis (Ho) for testing autocorrelation is that there is no autocorrelation while the null hypothesis (Ho) for normality test is that the time series is normal. The null hypothesis for F test states that the coefficients of all the explanatory variables are equal to zero. Besides, when the Durbin-Watson test tends to approach 2, it indicates that there is no autocorrelation. Otherwise, error terms are serially correlated negatively or positively.

For testing the goodness-of-fit, the Likelihood ratio test indicates that all explanatory variables jointly explain the VARX model as a whole. In other words, all the explanatory variables are jointly statistically significant in explaining the response variables. The F-tests generated for each agricultural TFP equation and service TFP equation also point out that the dependent variables are jointly explained by the independent variables and the model is a good fit. However, the F-test for the industry TFP equation in the system does not show joint statistical significance. This does not lead to rejection of the VARX model. Rather, it calls for the Granger causality test in order to identify the causality relationship for forecasting.

Table 11 also presents the diagnostic results of Portmanteau test and Durbin-Watson in order to check the existence of autocorrelation. The Portmanteau test on the basis of Ljung-Box test indicates that there is no serial residual correlation in the VARX model as whole at 10% level of significance. The Durbin-Watson test for each question tends to approach 2, indicating the inexistence of serial residual autocorrelation in each equation. Both the Jarque-Bera test and the Doornik-Hansen test confirm that the residuals in the system of VARX are not distributed normally. The Jarque-Bera test for each equation confirms

that the error terms in equation of industry and service normally distributed when testing at 5% level of significance. However, it is not normally distributed in the equation of agricultural TFP. This abnormality problem does not affect the property of BLUE and consistency. Nonetheless, it is mainly important to put on hypothesis about population parameters (Enders, 1995). Note that the VARX model considers heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors so that the model is free from the problems associated with heteroskedasticity. In a nutshell, the VARX model and the equations in the system satisfy the OLS assumptions.

5.10. Granger Causality Test

Table 12. Granger causality Wald tests Results

Equation	Excluded	chi2	df	Prob > chi2
TFPGA	TFPGI	10.654	2	0.005
TFPGA	TFPGS	21.687	2	0.000
TFPGA	ALL	32.374	4	0.000
TFPGI	TFPGA	0.46914	2	0.791
TFPGI	TFPGS	0.76883	2	0.681
TFPGI	ALL	1.0382	4	0.904
TFPGS	TFPGA	2.4435	2	0.295
TFPGS	TFPGI	0.23377	2	0.890
TFPGS	ALL	2.8896	4	0.574

Source:-Author's estimation

Testing the Granger causality for sectoral TFP growths using Wald test indicates that the agricultural TFP growth equation shows some causality relationship among sectors. It rejects the null hypothesis that industry TFP growth and/or service TFP growth, jointly and separately, does not cause agricultural TFP growth. In short, both industry and services

TFP Granger cause agricultural TFP growth. However, no sectoral TFP growth causes the industrial TFP growth and services TFP growth. This also indicates the poor sectoral economic performance and weak sectoral linkages with industry and service in terms of TFP growth (Table 12).

5.11. Stability Condition of the VARX Model and Analysis of One-Time Shock

Table 13. Eigen value stability condition

Eigen value	Modulus
-0.0205458 + .6758683i	.675871
-0.0205458 - .6758683i	.675871
-.15411940 + .4591577i	.484333
-.15411940 - .4591577i	.484333
.23281170 + .367998i	.435458
.2328117 - .367998i	.435458

Source: Author's estimation


Table 14. Variance Decomposition for Sectoral TFP growths

Decomposition of variance for Agricultural TFP growth rate				
period	std. error	TFPGA	TFPGI	TFPGS
1	0.0457416	100.0000	0.0000	0.0000
2	0.0521541	80.9157	3.8276	15.2568
3	0.0579284	73.1779	13.2353	13.5868
4	0.0604446	67.6702	15.9725	16.3574
5	0.0614732	66.4156	17.6001	15.9844
6	0.0620158	65.3027	18.3595	16.3378
7	0.0621838	65.1243	18.6064	16.2692
8	0.0622799	64.9297	18.7561	16.3142
9	0.0623091	64.9018	18.7969	16.3013
10	0.0623262	64.8674	18.8245	16.3081
Decomposition of variance for Industrial TFP growth rate				
period	std. error	TFPGA	TFPGI	TFPGS
1	0.39917	2.4942	97.5058	0.0000
2	0.404765	3.2360	96.7488	0.0152
3	0.41038	3.1546	96.1842	0.6611
4	0.410772	3.2429	96.0629	0.6942
5	0.411397	3.3057	95.9802	0.7141
6	0.411489	3.3107	95.9414	0.7480
7	0.411686	3.3344	95.9167	0.7489
8	0.411717	3.3346	95.9043	0.7610
9	0.411774	3.3400	95.8969	0.7631
10	0.411781	3.3401	95.8943	0.7657
Decomposition of variance for Service TFP growth rate				
period	std. error	TFPGA	TFPGI	TFPGS
1	0.153188	0.5324	0.4577	99.0099
2	0.158831	0.6379	0.8411	98.5210
3	0.162009	1.4183	0.8681	97.7136
4	0.164136	1.4043	1.1358	97.4599
5	0.164721	1.7589	1.4712	96.7699
6	0.165138	1.7500	1.5660	96.6840
7	0.165372	1.8286	1.7249	96.4465
8	0.165433	1.8279	1.7455	96.4266
9	0.165492	1.8422	1.7881	96.3697
10	0.1655	1.8424	1.7916	96.3660

Source:-Author's estimation

The requirement of satisfying the stability condition of the VARX model points out that the unit roots or the solutions of the VARX system are below one, or all the Eigen values lie inside the unit circle, which is the necessary and sufficient condition for stability. Otherwise, the impact of the impulse

(shock) in some variables might not decrease with time. A crucial condition for the VAR model to be valid and consistent requires the covariance to be stationary in order to avoid the formation of explosive roots. This confirms that the VARX model the study uses satisfy the stability condition and can be used for forecasting. Graphically, the result confirms the stationarity of VARX as all characteristic roots lie inside the unit circle.



Source: Author's estimation

Figure 2. Stability Test for VARX


N.B: - For a characteristic equation of the type, $a\lambda^2 + b\lambda + c = 0$, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 = \frac{-b}{2a} \pm \frac{\sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} = \alpha \pm \beta i$; Real roots: $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 = \alpha \pm \beta$ Imaginary roots: $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 = \alpha \pm \beta i$ where $i = \sqrt{-1}$. In general case, the modulus of a complex number, $a + bi$ is $\sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$. The stability of the VAR model requires the moduli of the Eigen values to lie within the unit circle. Otherwise, the system is not stationary. Rather it is explosive or non-convergent.

As the VARX model is stable, the next issues the paper discusses are the impulse response functions and variance decomposition in response to a one-time shock in the system. The Impulse Response Function refers to the dynamic interactions among endogenous variables of sectoral TFP growths and traces the effect of a one-time shock on current and future values of the endogenous variables. It sheds light for empirical causal analysis and policy effectiveness. Figure 3 in this regard shows the impulse response functions in the 10 forecasting periods and indicates how the sectoral TFP growths responded to a change in the other variables. As can be seen from the figure 3, all the responses in each equation are high at the initial period and the shock then dies through time and then tends towards zero at the end of 10 years. Each row of the graph indicates the response of sectoral TFP growths in one sector over time to a positive shock emanated from the TFP growths of the other two sectors. All shocks create an explosive time path at the initial period and then converge to zero after some time, dying through time. This confirms that the VAR system is stable. Note that an unstable system would produce an explosive and divergent time path.

N.B: - tfpga, tfpgi and tfpgs stands for TFP growth rate in the agriculture, industry and services sectors.

Variance Decomposition refers to the separation of the variation in an endogenous variable into the component shocks during the forecast period. It also provides information about the contribution or the share of each sectoral TFP growths to the variation of the endogenous variables in each equation. Accordingly, 65 percent of the error variance of agricultural TFP growth in the agricultural

TFP equation is explained by own shock while the remaining 35 percent is explained by the shocks on industrial TFP growth (26 percent) and the service TFP growth (9 percent). However, the equations of industrial and services TFP growths are heavily explained by own shocks: 94 percent and 89 percent respectively. This reflects both industry and services are relatively weak in sectoral linkage (Table 14).



Source:-Author's estimation

Figure 3. Impulse Response Function for Sectoral TFP growths

6. Conclusion and Policy Prescriptions

The Ethiopian economy has performed with erratic growth rate and sluggish structural change over the period 1970-2010. It also exhibited a very low and negative growth rate seven times in the reference period, indicating the existence of recurrent drought that occurred every five year. Moreover, the structure of the GDP was characterized by low and stagnant share of the manufacturing sector (4.8 percent on average) that was expected to drive productivity and sustain economic performance. In the consequence of the lion's share of service sector in GDP, the economy tended to encounter a structural change burden as explained by Baumol's disease (Baumol, 1967). One of the causative factors, among others, is the persistence of low and erratic TFP growth over the reference period. It is hard and unthinkable to achieve sustaining economic growth without

structural change that mainly emanated from growth in TFP. Increasing the growth rate of sectoral TFP is one of the principal sources of perpetual growth as it has a nature of an increasing return to scale. As TFP is capable of curing the problems, the study identifies the key determinant of TFP for agriculture, industry and service sector using VARX model.


The estimates by the sectoral growth accounting approach confirmed that factor accumulation explains the growth trajectory in Ethiopia. Labour is the dominant source of the agricultural growth while capital deepening is the big source of growth in industry and services over the period 1972-2011. However, the study also finds that the sectoral TFP growth rates are erratic with negative performance on average, reflecting the existence of the lack of efficiency and the shortage of technological change in the economy and creating severe economic debacles and a deadlock situation. Therefore, the study is engaged in looking for factors that influence this stochastic and low sectoral TFP growth. The VARX model that accounts for both endogenous and exogenous variables produces remarkable econometric results in this regard. Out of the determinants of agricultural

TFP, foreign trade openness, industrial TFP and service TFP at lag, and imported capital goods and service are statistically significant and positively influence the current agricultural TFP. Regarding the industrial TFP growth, it is only the growth rate of imported capital goods that is statistically significant and positively influences the industrial TFP. The service TFP is negatively influenced by openness and positively affected by liberalization index. However, the growth rate of expenditure on R&D negatively influences the current growth rate of agricultural and service TFP in the case of Ethiopia.


Based on these findings, the study draws multifaceted policy implications at sectoral level in the face of achieving remarkable economic growth with structural change. For increasing agricultural TFP, there must be a policy that favors both industrial and service TFP as they positively influence the current growth of agricultural TFP. Moreover, the government should attempt to widen the openness of the economy to international trade as it allows the economy to acquire advanced technologies and intermediate capital that scale up the production capacity and agricultural TFP. This also widens opportunity for acquisition and exposition that causes the agricultural TFP to grow more, creating a fertile ground for agricultural technology transfer from abroad. On top of this, enhancing the growth rate of imported capital goods and service is a recommended policy in order to foster industrial TFP growth. For increasing service TFP, the government should liberalize the service trade and allow increasing participation of private investors. It requires lesser service trade restriction and regulation for both domestic and foreign investment in the service sector.

In general, the government should focus on technology transfer from abroad instead of engaging in costly technology innovation in area of agriculture and industry. Moreover, it also revisits the level of liberalization in area of foreign trade and domestic service trade in order to scale up the performance of agriculture and service sectors.


Annex 1: Zivot-Andrews unit root test allowing a break in intercept for




a) Agricultural TFP growth




b) Industrial TFP growth




c) Service TFP growth




d) Agricultural research and development expenditure growth




e) Roal Network expansion growth




f) Imported capital good growth




g) growth rate of pupil in primary school



h) Inflation rate



i) Openness



j) Liberalization index

Source:-Author's estimation based on ZA unit root test


Annex 2: Clemente-Montanes-Reyes unit-root test with double mean shifts for




a) IO test Inflation rate



b) IO test Openness




c) IO test Liberalization index



d) AO test Inflation rate



e) AO test Openness



f) AO test Liberalization index

Source:-Author's estimation based on the CMR unit root test

References

- [1] Abdih, Y. and Joutz, F. (2005), Relating the Knowledge Production Function to Total Factor Productivity: An Endogenous Growth Puzzle, IMF Working Paper No. WP/05/74.
- [2] Abramovitz, M. (1956), Resource and Output Trends in the United States since 1870, *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, 46: 5-23.
- [3] Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1992), a Model of Growth through Creation Destruction, *Journal of Econometric*, Vol. 60, No. 2.PP0: 323-51
- [4] Aitken, J. and Harrison, E. (1999), Do domestic firms benefit from foreign direct investment? Evidence from Venezuela”, *American Economic Review*, vol. 89, pp. 605-18.
- [5] Akinlo, E. (2005), Impact of Macroeconomic Factors on Total Factor Productivity in Sub-Saharan African Countries” Research Paper No. 39 UN-WIDER
- [6] Andres, I. (2007), Determinants of Total Factor Productivity: A Literature Review, United Nation Industrial Development Organization, UNIDO
- [7] Arnold, J., Javorcik, A., and Mattoo, A. (2007), The Productivity Effects of Services Liberalization: Evidence from the Czech Republic, WB Working Paper, No. 4109, World Bank
- [8] Aschauer D. (1989), Is public expenditure productive? *Journal of Monetary Economics* 23, 177-200.
- [9] Asghar A. (2007), Macro Determinants of Total Factor Productivity Growth of Agriculture in Pakistan, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Agriculture Faisalabad
- [10] Barro, R.J. (1990), Government Spending in a Simple Model of Endogenous Growth, *Journal of Political Economy*, (95):103-25.
- [11] Baumol, W. (1967), Macroeconomics of unbalanced growth: The anatomy of urban crisis, *American Economic Review*, 57 (3), 415-426.
- [12] Benhabib, J. and Spiegel, M. (1994), The Role of Human Capital in Economic Development: Evidence from Aggregate Cross-Country Data, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 34(2).
- [13] Bosworth, B., Collins S., and Virmani A. (2007), Sources of Growth in the Indian Economy. NBER Working Paper 12901
- [14] Chen, C. and Dahlman, C.J. (2004), Knowledge and Development: A Cross-Section Approach, Policy Research Working Paper, No. 3366, and Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [15] Chenery, H.B. (1960), Pattern of Industrial Growth, the *American Economic Review* 50 (4): 624-654
- [16] Chenery, H.B. and Taylor L. (1968), Development patterns among countries and over time, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 50:391-416.
- [17] Chole, E. (1992), Underdevelopment in Ethiopia, a Book published by OSSR in memorial of Eshetu’s Work, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia Oxford University Press (1958).
- [18] Clemete, J., Montanes, A., and Reyes, M. (1998), Testing for a unit root in Variables with a double change in the Mean, *Economic Letters*, Vol. 59.
- [19] Dollar, D. and Sokoloff k.(1990), Patterns of Productivity Growth in South Korean Manufacturing Industries, 1963-1979, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol.33, pp. 309-308.
- [20] Easterly William, (2002), Economic Growth in Ethiopia: Retrospect, and Prospect. Ethiopia.
- [21] Easterly, W. and Rebelo, S. (1993), Fiscal Policy and Economic Growth: An Empirical Investigation, NBER Working Paper No. 4499, Cambridge, MA: NBER
- [22] ECA (2011), Economic Report on Africa 2011, governing development in African-the role of the State in economic transformation, Economic Commission for Africa, Addis Ababa
- [23] Enders, W. (1995), applied econometrics in Time series, *Econometrics Journal* article, New York.
- [24] Fan S. and Zhang, X. (2004), Infrastructure and regional economic development in rural China, *China Economic Review* 15: 203-214.
- [25] Fisher, A. and Clark, C. (1939), Production, primary, secondary and tertiary, *Economic Record* 15
- [26] Geda, A. and Degefe, B.(2005), Explaining African Growth Performance: The Case of Ethiopia, AERC Collaborative Research Project, Nairobi, Kenya.
- [27] Geda A., Shimeles A. and John Weeks (2008), Growth, Poverty And Inequality In Ethiopia: Which Way For Pro-Poor Growth?, *Journal of International Development*
- [28] Grossman, G. and Helpman, E. (1991), Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991, chapters 1-5.
- [29] Hafiz K., Muhammad I., and Muhammad A.(2010), Exploring the effect of TFP growth on future output, *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, Vol. 48, pp 105-122.
- [30] Hirschman, A.O. (1958), the Strategy of Economic Development, New Haven, Yale University Press
- [31] Hulten, R. (1996), Infrastructure Capital and Economic Growth: How Well You Use It May Be More Important Than How Much You Have, NBER Working Paper No. 5847, Cambridge,
- [32] Isaksson, A. (2002), Human Capital and Economic Growth: A Survey of the Empirical Literature from 1990 to the Present, mimeo, Vienna: UNIDO.
- [33] Johnston, F. and Mellor, W. (1961), The Role Of Agriculture In Economic Development, *American Economic Review* 51(4):566-593.
- [34] Jones, C.I. (1995), R&D-Based Models of Economic Growth, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 103(4),
- [35] Keller, W. and Yeaple S.R. (2003), Multinational Enterprises, International Trade, and Productivity Growth: Firm-Level Evidence from the United States, NBER Working Paper No. 9504, Cambridge, MA: NBER.
- [36] Khan, S. (2006), Macro Determinants of Total Factor Productivity in Pakistan, State Bank of Pakistan, Working Paper Number 10.

- [37] Kongsamut P., Rebelo S., and Xie D. (1997), *Beyond Balanced Growth*, NBER Working Paper Series 6159, Cambridge, MA 02318
- [38] Krueger, M. (1988), Policy lessons from development experience since the Second World War, *Handbook of development economics* Volume 1. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- [39] Kumar and Russell (2002), Technological Change, Technological Catch-up, and Capital Deepening: Relative Contributions to Growth and Convergence, *American Economic Review* 92(3)
- [40] Kuznets, S. (1961), *Capital in the American economy*, National Bureau of Economic Research, USA
- [41] Kuznets, S. (1966), *Modern economic growth*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- [42] Lin, J. (2012), *New Structural Economics: A Framework for Rethinking Development and Policy*, Policy Research Working Paper 5197, World Bank, Washington DC.
- [43] Lucas, R. (1988), On the Mechanics of Economic Development, *Journal of Monthly Economics* 22,3/42
- [44] Matthews, R. (1986), The economics of institutions and the sources of growth, *The Economic Journal*, 96,903-18.
- [45] Mayer, J. (2001), *Technology Diffusion, Human Capital and Economic Growth in Developing Countries*, Discussion Papers, No. 154, Geneva:
- [46] Nachege, C. and Fontaine, T. (2006), *Economic Growth and Total Factor Productivity in Niger*, IMF Working Paper 06:208.
- [47] Nelson, R. and Phelps, S. (1966), Investment in Humans, Technological Diffusion, and Economic Growth, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 56, pp. 69-75.
- [48] Ngai, L. (2004), Barriers and the transition to modern growth, *Journal of Monetary Economic* 51
- [49] Nicoletti, G. and Scarpetta, S. (2003), *Regulation, Productivity, and Growth: OECD Evidence*, Vol. 36
- [50] Perron, P. (1989). The great crash, the oil price shock, and the unit root hypothesis, *Econometrica*, 57(6):1361-1401
- [51] Rahmato, D. (2004), *The Agricultural Policies of the imperial regime: what Lessons can we draw? discussion paper presented on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the establishment of Alemaya University*
- [52] Rodrik, D. (1999), where did all the growth go? External shocks, social conflict, and growth collapse, *Journal of Economic Growth*. 4: 385-412.
- [53] Rodrik, D. (2003), *In search of Prosperity: analytic narratives on Economic Growth*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- [54] Rodrik, D. (2006), *Industrial development: Stylized facts and policies*, Draft paper, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. <http://ksghome.harvard.edu/drodrik/industrial%20development.pdf>.
- [55] Romer, P.M. (1986), Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth, *J. Political Economy*, 94: 1002-1037
- [56] Romer, P.M. (1990), Endogenous Technological Change, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, S71-103
- [57] Rosenstein-Rodan, P. (1964), *Capital formation and economic development*, M.I.T. University Press
- [58] Rubina, V. (2008), *The service Sector Revolution in India, a Quantitative analysis*, United Nations University, UNU-WIDER, Research paper No. 2008/72.
- [59] Solow, R. (1956), a Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics (The MIT Press)* 70 (1): 65-94.
- [60] Stephen, J. (2001), *Old and New Growth Theories: A Unifying Structure?* Stephen J. Turnovsky's University of Washington, Seattle WA 98195, University of Pisa
- [61] Thaddee, B., Xinshen D., Terry R., and Agapi S. (2009), *Dynamics of Structural Transformation, An Empirical Characterization in the Case of China, Malaysia, and Ghana*, From IFPRI Discussion Paper 00856, April 2009, Volume 2011 (2011), Article ID 492325, China
- [62] Thomas, H. and Marinos, T. (2010), *Primary Factor Shares, GTAP estimation of share of factors of production in agriculture sector*, GTAP, <https://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu>
- [63] Todaro, M.P. and Smith, S.C. (2011), *Economic Development*, 11th edition, University of New York
- [64] Torfinn, H. and Jorn, R (2005), *Looking Abroad to Understand Productivity Growth: The World Technology Frontier and Industrial Sector Productivity in South Africa*.
- [65] WB (2011), *World Development Indicator Report for 2011 and statistical data online version*, World Bank, Washington, DC
- [66] William, E. and Ross, L., 2001), *It's Not Factor Accumulation: Stylized Facts and Growth Models*, the *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (2001), pp. 177-219, Oxford University
- [67] Zivot, E. and Andrews, W.K. (1992), further Evidence on the Great Crash, the Oil-Price Shock, and the Unit root Hypothesis, *Journal of Business and economics*, Vol. 10.