



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This may be the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Kumar, Ronald Ravinesh](#), Stauvermann, Peter, Loganathan, Nanthakumar, & Kumar, Radhika Devi
(2015)

Exploring the role of energy, trade and financial development in explaining economic growth in South Africa: A revisit.

Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 52, pp. 1300-1311.

This file was downloaded from: <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/88919/>

© Consult author(s) regarding copyright matters

This work is covered by copyright. Unless the document is being made available under a Creative Commons Licence, you must assume that re-use is limited to personal use and that permission from the copyright owner must be obtained for all other uses. If the document is available under a Creative Commons License (or other specified license) then refer to the Licence for details of permitted re-use. It is a condition of access that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights. If you believe that this work infringes copyright please provide details by email to qut.copyright@qut.edu.au

License: Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 2.5

Notice: *Please note that this document may not be the Version of Record (i.e. published version) of the work. Author manuscript versions (as Submitted for peer review or as Accepted for publication after peer review) can be identified by an absence of publisher branding and/or typeset appearance. If there is any doubt, please refer to the published source.*

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.188>

1
2
3
4 **Exploring the role of energy, trade and financial development in**
5 **explaining economic growth in South Africa: a revisit**
6
7

8 **Abstract**

9 South Africa is an emerging and industrializing economy which is experiencing
10 remarkable progress. We contend that amidst the developments in the economy, the
11 role of energy, trade openness and financial development are critical. In this article, we
12 revisit the pivotal role of these factors. We use the ARDL bounds (Pesaran et al.
13 2001), the Bayer and Hank (2013) cointegration techniques, and an extended Cobb-
14 Douglas framework, to examine the long-run association with output per worker over
15 the sample period 1971-2011. The results support long-run association between output
16 per worker, capital per worker and the shift parameters. The short-run elasticity
17 coefficients are as follows: energy (0.24), trade (0.07), financial development (-0.03).
18 In the long-run, the elasticity coefficients are: trade openness (0.05), energy (0.29),
19 and financial development (-0.04). In both the short-run and the long-run, we note the
20 post-2000 period has a marginal positive effect on the economy. The Toda and
21 Yamamoto (1995) Granger causality results show that a unidirectional causality from
22 capital stock and energy consumption to output; and from capital stock to trade
23 openness; a bidirectional causality between trade openness and output; and absence
24 (neutrality) of any causality between financial development and output thus indicating
25 that these two variables evolve independent of each other.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Keywords:** energy; trade openness; financial development; economic growth;
43 cointegration; causality; South Africa.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 **1. Introduction**

7 South Africa is an upper middle-income country and the second largest African economy behind
8 Nigeria with a gross national income per capita of US\$ 7,190 in 2013. South Africa is part of the
9 South African Customs Union (SACU) which comprises of Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and
10 Swaziland. Services are critical to the diversification of the SACU economies. The population
11 size stands at about 53 million. Services accounts for 68.4% of South Africa's GDP, the
12 manufacturing and mining sector for 22% and agriculture for 2.6% (World Bank, 2014a).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 After the breakdown of the apartheid regime and ending of the economic sanctions of the USA
21 and European Union in the middle of the 1990s, South Africa's gross domestic product has
22 tripled since 1996. Nevertheless, the income inequality in South Africa is very large as noted
23 from the Gini-coefficient of 0.631 in 2009. This is partly explained by the high unemployment
24 rate which is around 25% (2012) (World Bank, 2014a) or 33% including discouraged workers
25 (World Bank, 2012). Additionally, the average income of a non-white citizen is much lower than
26 the average income of white citizens. According to Leibbrandt et al. (2010), citizens with Asian
27 background earned on average only 60% of the average income of a white person in 2008, black
28 citizens only 13% and coloured citizens only 22% of the average income of a white person.
29 According to the World Bank (2014a) some 31% of the population has less than \$ PPP 2 per day
30 in 2009. On the other hand, the 40% top income earners received 84.5% of the total income in
31 2009. Despite that the GDP per capita increased by just 30% since the late 1990s, those below
32 the 40th income percentile experienced a significant decline of their market income (World Bank,
33 2012). Only the provision of social assistance grants prevented them from experiencing a real
34 income decline.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Even though the financial sector of South Africa is relatively well-developed compared to other
50 middle income countries (World Bank, 2013), it must be noted that close to a third of the
51 population does not have a bank account and millions have limited access to formal financial
52 services which includes micro and small businesses. Besides the problem of huge income
53 differences, high concentration of financial service providers, a lack of microfinance institutions,
54 and gaps in the regulatory environment pose challenges to financial inclusion. On the one hand,
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the small and medium enterprises (SMEs) are poised to innovate and expand the export markets
5 in the economy; on the other hand, access of SMEs to credit is constrained. South Africa faces
6 considerable challenges in financial inclusion, particularly caused by the uneven access to and
7 use of financial services and by the concentrated ownership structure of the banking sector.
8 Other factors such as distance and travel costs, policy induced distortions such as interest rate
9 caps on lending and limitations on competition in the retail payment sector largely explain the
10 weak financial inclusivity.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 As a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) under the specific commitments in the
20 trade in services in the Uruguay round, South Africa made commitments in the insurance and
21 insurance related, banking and other financial services sector. In the banking sector, South
22 Africa's commitments on national treatment specify that natural persons holding deposit
23 accounts in branches of banks not incorporated in South Africa will need to meet the minimum
24 capital requirement. Given that the banking sector is owned by private companies and a sector
25 that is competitive, commitments in this sector are justified.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 International trade is very important for South Africa because the trade volume accounts for just
33 over 50% of the GDP (World Bank, 2014a). The export value of minerals, fuels and products
34 from the metal sector add up to 50% of the total exports and these products account for some
35 90% of the export growth between 2007 and 2012 (World Bank, 2014b). Additionally, a crucial
36 sector of South Africa's economy is the electricity sector, which is wholly state-owned. The
37 state-owned firm Eskom supplies most of the electricity to the South African market (just 95%)
38 and also exports electricity to neighbouring countries within the Customs Union (CU).
39 Additionally, South African municipalities and private companies serve the rest of electricity
40 market. Despite this, it must be noted that South Africa suffers since the middle of the 2000
41 because of rolling blackouts. Eskom seems to be unable to eliminate the lack of capacity.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The electricity/energy sector on the other hand is not committed under the General Agreements
53 on Trade in Services (GATS). This could be a direct result of the state owned interference in the
54 sector which as a result limits market access. However, the rationale for energy being a crucial
55 sector for South Africa's development and its cascading implications for other sectors may be a
56 reason why the state controls this very crucial resource. Against this background, it is apparent
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 that the role of the above-mentioned sectors needs to be explored within the context of its
5 consequent contributions to economic growth. Subsequently, we investigate empirically the
6 impact of energy consumption, trade openness and financial development on the growth and
7 development of South Africa.
8
9
10

11
12
13 A few studies have looked at the nexus between energy consumption (Kumar and Kumar 2013;
14 Odhiambo 2010; Wolde-Rufael 2006), trade openness (Menyah et al. 2014; Polat et al. 2014)
15 and financial development (Menyah et al. 2014, Kumar, 2012; Gries et al. 2009; and Wolde-
16 Rufael 2009) in the African countries. Although these factors are germane to the growth and
17 development of Africa, prior studies have considered the role of these variables either in
18 isolation or with different methods of assessment, thus resulting in mixed conclusions (Polat et
19 al. 2014). For instance, Kumar and Kumar (2013) support the energy-led growth hypothesis in
20 South Africa and Kenya; Kumar (2012) looks at the role of financial development and
21 remittances on output in the Sub-Saharan Africa, and finds that financial development per se
22 does not have any statistically significant impact on output per worker; Menyah et al. (2014)
23 looks at 21 African countries (including South Africa) and finds no evidence of finance-led
24 growth and trade-led growth hypothesis in majority of the SSA countries. Polat et al (2014) find
25 mixed results where trade has a negative effect while financial development has a positive effect
26 on the economic growth. In this regard, this paper contributes to the literature in providing
27 another perspective on South Africa's economic growth viz. energy, trade and financial
28 development which closely characterize the booming and transformative economy of South
29 Africa.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 We start with the augmented Solow type Cobb-Douglas model (Kumar and Kumar 2013; Kumar
47 et al. 2014) as the framework of analysis. The paper is motivated by the following stylized facts
48 about South Africa: (1) Trade openness plays a critical role in the growth process of the
49 economy, although there are signs of poor performances of exports from the country, (2) the
50 financial sector is reasonably developed, however, there remains a large number of population
51 without complete access to financial services; and (3) energy is an extremely important source of
52 economic growth as it feeds into other productive economic activities. Hence claiming energy as
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the key source of economic growth besides capital productivity, we extend the model of Kumar
5 and Kumar (2013) with trade openness and financial development.
6
7
8

9
10 Subsequently, contending the role of energy consumption, we examine the energy elasticity with
11 other critical factors influencing growth – trade openness and financial development, and finally
12 review the causality effects. The study largely benefits from background information and
13 insights provided in a number of studies (Odhiambo 2010; Wolde-Rufael 2006; Kumar and
14 Kumar, 2013; Kumar 2012; Polat et al. 2014). Briefly, our findings are consistent with Kumar
15 and Kumar (2013), Menyah et al (2014), and Odhiambo (2010), and deviates from Polat et al.
16 (2014) and Wolde-Rufael (2006). In summary, the results show that capital per worker, and
17 energy explains a bulk of the economic growth. Trade positively influence the output level,
18 thereby supporting the trade-led growth hypothesis in South Africa. However, we note that it has
19 a negative effect on labour productivity. The rest of the paper is set out as follows. In section 2,
20 we provide a brief literature survey. In section 3, we discuss the framework, data, method and
21 results. Finally in section 4, some concluding remarks follow.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 33 **2. A brief literature survey**

34
35 There are a huge number of studies exploring the nexus between energy, trade openness,
36 financial development and economic growth. To motivate our paper, we briefly mention a few.¹
37
38
39

40 41 *2.1 Energy and growth*

42
43 When considering the nexus between energy and economic growth, the findings from studies
44 converge to one of the four hypotheses. According to Payne (2010, 2011) the energy-growth
45 causality can be divided into (1) the growth hypothesis; (2) the conservation hypothesis, (3) the
46 neutrality hypothesis; and (4) the feedback hypothesis. The growth hypothesis supports a
47 unidirectional causality from energy consumption to economic growth; the conservation
48 hypothesis supports unidirectional causality from economic growth to electricity consumption;
49 (3) the neutrality hypothesis supports absence of any causal relationship between electricity
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹ Please note that the list of studies mentioned here are not exhaustive. Given space limitations, we record only a
60 few. Notably, recent literature on economic growth studies now considers the role of energy with other relevant and
61 contemporary drivers such as trade and financial development.
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 consumption and economic growth; and (4) the feedback hypothesis supports a bidirectional
5 causation between energy consumption and growth.
6
7
8

9
10 Evidence supporting the growth hypothesis includes: Stern (1993, 2000) for the US, Erol and Yu
11 (1987) for Japan, Masih and Masih (1996) for India and Indonesia, Glasure and Lee (1998) for
12 Singapore, Soytaş and Sari (2003) for Turkey, France, Germany and Japan, Wolde-Rufael (2004)
13 for Shanghai, Lee (2005) for eighteen developing countries, Odhiambo (2009) for Tanzania,
14 Odhiambo (2010) for South Africa and Kenya, Kumar and Kumar (2013) for South Africa and
15 Kumar et al. (2015) for Gibraltar.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 The studies supporting the conservation hypothesis dates back to Kraft and Kraft (1978) which
23 examine the US economy and find a unidirectional causality from income to energy. Many other
24 similar studies followed. Among these include: Abosedra and Baghestani (1989) for the US and
25 Soytaş and Sari (2003) for South Korea, Erol and Yu (1987) for West Germany, Masih and Masih
26 (1996) for Indonesia, Soytaş and Sari (2003) for Italy, Oh and Lee (2004a) for South Korea,
27 Wolde-Rufael (2005) for of the African countries, Narayan and Smyth (2005) for Australia, Lee
28 (2006) for France, Italy and Japan, Huang et al. (2008) for middle income groups (lower and
29 upper middle income groups) and high income group countries, and Odhiambo (2009) for Congo
30 (DRC), and Kumar et al. (2014) for Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Studies that support the neutrality hypothesis are Yu and Hwang (1984), Erol and Yu (1987) for
42 the case of the US, Masih and Masih (1996) for Malaysia, Singapore and Philippines, Glasure
43 and Lee (1998) for South Korea (based on the standard Granger causality), Soytaş and Sari
44 (2003) for nine countries including the US, Asafu-Adjaye (2000) for Indonesia and India,
45 Altınay and Karagol (2004) for Turkey, Wolde-Rufael (2005) for eleven African countries
46 (including Kenya and South Africa), Lee (2006) for the UK, Germany and Sweden, Soytaş and
47 Sari (2006) for China; and Huang et al. (2008) for low income group countries.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Quite a few studies support the feedback hypothesis. Among these are: Erol and Yu (1987) for
56 Japan and Italy, Masih and Masih (1996) for Pakistan, Glasure and Lee (1998) for South Korea
57 and Singapore, Soytaş and Sari (2003) for Argentina, Ghali and El-Sakka (2004) for Canada, Oh
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 and Lee (2004b) for Korea, Wolde-Rufael (2005) for Gabon and Zambia, Lee (2006) for the US,
5 and Mahadevan and Asafu-Adjaye (2007) for energy exporting developed countries. Shahbaz et
6 al (2013a) investigate the relationship between energy use and economic growth by
7 incorporating financial development, international trade and capital in case of China over the
8 sample period 1971-2011, and find all variables including energy use have a positive impact on
9 economic growth. In another study, Shahbaz et al (2013b) examine a similar relationship in case
10 of Indonesia using quarterly data and find that economic growth and energy consumption
11 increase while financial development and trade openness reduce the CO₂ emissions, respectively.
12 Polat et al. (2014) examine the link between financial development, trade openness and
13 economic growth in South Africa and find financial development has a negative but not-
14 statistically significant association in the short-run and a positive association in the long run.
15 Jebli and Youssef (2014) in using panel data examine the relationship between renewable energy
16 consumption, trade and output of 11 African countries (Algeria, Gabon, Mauritius, Swaziland,
17 Comoros, Ghana, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Kenya, and Sudan) over the period 1980-2008 and
18 find inter alia, that in the long run, renewable energy consumption and trade (measured by
19 exports and imports) have a statistically significant and positive impact on output.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 *2.2 Trade Openness and Growth*

36
37 The question of whether trade promotes economic growth gain greater attention after the seminal
38 article by Romer (1986), paving way to further insightful contributions in the literature
39 (Grossman and Helpman 1990, 1991; Rivera-Batiz and Romer 1991; Young, 1991; Taylor,
40 1993; Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 1997; Ventura, 1997; Redding, 1999). More recent literature
41 includes the work of Connolly (2000), Howitt (2000), Acemoglu et al. (2002), Galor and
42 Mountford (2006), Wacziarg and Welch (2008), and Coe et al. (2009). Chang and Mendy
43 (2012) examine the effects of trade policies on economic growth in 36 African countries
44 (including South Africa) over the period 1980-2009. Their results show that openness in trade
45 and investment is statistically significant and positively related to economic growth. In general,
46 there is consensus that trade promotes economic growth. According to Yenokyan et al. (2014),
47 trade influences economic activities through two channels: an aggregate scale effect and
48 technology transfer. The scale effect is realized from trade openness which results in increase in
49 firms' size and subsequently leads lower average costs and hence increased output per firm. The
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 technology transfer channel arises as a result of knowledge spill-over which is brought about as
5 countries develop the infrastructure such as communications to facilitate greater trade activities.
6
7 Jouini (2014) examines the links between international trade and economic growth in GCC (Gulf
8 Cooperation Council) member countries over the sample period 1980-2010. The results show
9 that economic growth responds positively to trade openness both in the short-run and the long-
10 run.
11
12
13
14

15 16 17 *2.3 Financial development and Growth* 18

19 The literature on financial development and economic growth dates back to at least Schumpeter,
20 (1912), Goldsmith (1969), McKinnon (1973), Shaw (1973) and Levine (1997) which resonates
21 the unequivocal fact that financial sectors (can be) are pivotal in reallocating and mobilizing
22 resources to most productive investments, diversifying risks and supporting growth of other
23 sectors and subsequently being the engine of economic growth. Moreover, the discussion on
24 financial and banking sector development has been linked to the advancement of technology and
25 the need for stable sources of capital inflows for the sector to realize expansion in credit. Often,
26 three indicators are used to assess financial development. These include: bank credit to the
27 private sector as a percent of GDP, turnover rate of stock market or value of shares traded as a
28 percent of GDP, and the extent of shareholder and creditor protection as part of the legal or
29 regulatory characteristics of a financial system (King and Levine 1993a,b; Levine and Zervos
30 1998).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 It is argued that greater financial depth measured by the ratio of financial asset to income is
43 associated with higher levels of productivity and thus per capita income. Financial systems serve
44 multiple objectives in expediting economic activities—they produce information ex ante about
45 possible investments; mobilize and pool savings and allocate capital; monitor investments and
46 exert corporate governance after providing finance; facilitate the trading, diversification and
47 management of risk; and ease the exchange of goods and services (Beck et al. 2000; Greenwood
48 and Jovanovic 1990; King and Levine 1993a; 1993b; Levine and Zervos 1998; McKinnon 1973;
49 Levine 1997). Greater accessibility of financial services to more individuals spreads out risk,
50 which in turn boosts investment activity in both physical and human capital, thus supporting
51 output growth.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 A number of research shows a positive relationship between economic growth and financial
7 development (Christopoulos and Tsionas 2004; King and Levine 1993a,b Neusser and Kugler
8 1998; Rosseau and Wachtel 1998; Shan and Jianhong 2006; Hye and Dolgoplova 2011;
9 Perera and Paudel 2009). On the hand, some studies have shown that financial development does
10 not support economic growth. Hassan et al. (2011) find that there has been a positive association
11 between finance and economic growth for developing countries but contradictory results for
12 high-income countries. The consensus of various other studies is that there is a positive
13 correlation between financial development and economic growth despite mixed views on the
14 direction of causality between the two (Khan and Senhadji 2003; Odhiambo 2010; Savvides
15 1995).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 In regards to studies pertaining to SSA, Ghirmay (2004) explores the causal link between
27 financial development and economic growth in 13 SSA countries and find a unidirectional
28 causation from financial development to economic growth for in 8 countries and bi-directional
29 causation for 6 countries, hence concluding that African countries can accelerate economic
30 growth by improving financial systems. Agbetsiafa (2004) examines the causality nexus between
31 financial development and economic growth for 8 SSA countries including South Africa over the
32 sample 1963-2001. The results show a unidirectional causation from financial development to
33 economic growth in Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Togo and Zambia and a bi-
34 directional causality in Kenya and Zambia.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Odhiambo (2007) investigates the direction of causality between financial development and
45 economic growth for Kenya, South Africa and Tanzania, and finds that the direction of causality
46 is sensitive to the choice of measurement for financial development. Wolde-Rufael (2009)
47 reports a bi-directional causality between economic growth and financial development in Kenya.
48 Gries et al. (2009) find a weak causal link between financial depths and economic growth and
49 find evidence of finance-led growth in Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and South Africa; bidirectional
50 causation for Nigeria and Senegal; a reverse causation (growth to financial development) for
51 Cameroon, Ghana, and Madagascar. Furthermore, they find finance causes openness for Gabon,
52 Kenya, Nigeria and Sierra Leone; and trade openness causes finance for Ghana, Madagascar, and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Rwanda; and bidirectional causation for Burundi, Mauritius, Senegal and South Africa. Ahmed
5 and Wahid (2011) examine the relationship between financial structure and economic growth in
6 for seven African countries (Botswana, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Nigeria and
7 South Africa) and they find presence of causality running from financial activity to economic
8 growth in Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa; and a reverse causation in Mauritius and South
9 Africa. Moreover, they also find that the financial structure (index based on the ratio of stock
10 market total value traded and capitalization to private credit) caused income in Cote d'Ivoire,
11 Mauritius and South Africa.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Fowowe (2011) examines the causal relationship between financial development and economic
22 growth for 17 SSA countries and finds a homogeneous bi-directional causality between financial
23 development and economic growth. In contrast, Demetriades and James (2011) examine 18 SSA
24 countries for 1975–2006 and find bank liabilities in Sub-Saharan Africa are follow (but not lead)
25 economic growth and the link between bank credit and growth is altogether absent. However,
26 Chang and Mendy (2012) find a negative association between domestic savings on growth in
27 Africa and highlight the need to improve the current financial markets to ensure better utilization
28 of resources. Menyah et al. (2014) find a unidirectional causality running from financial
29 development to economic growth in Benin, Sierra Leone and South Africa, and a reverse
30 causality from economic growth to financial development is noted in Nigeria; and a bi-
31 directional causality for Zambia; a unidirectional causality running from financial development
32 and trade is noted in Burundi, Malawi, Niger, Senegal and Sudan, and a reverse causality in
33 Gabon; a unidirectional causation from trade to economic growth is noted in Benin, Sierra Leone
34 and South Africa; and a reverse causality is noted in Kenya and Madagascar, and a bi-directional
35 causation for Gabon.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **3. Framework, Data, Method and Results**

52 *3.1 Framework*

53 The modelling framework follows the extended Cobb-Douglas type production function with
54 insights from Solow (Solow, 1956) and used in Kumar and Kumar (2013) and Kumar et al.
55 (2014). In this model, the per worker output (y_t) equation is defined as:
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$$y_t = A_t k_t^\alpha, \quad \alpha > 0 \quad (1)$$

where A = stock of technology and k = capital per worker, and α is the profit share. The Solow model assumes that the evolution of technology is given by:

$$A_t = A_0 e^{gT} \quad (2)$$

where A_0 is the initial stock of knowledge and T is time.

The time variant technology is ‘unpacked’ and defined to include energy, trade openness and financial development. Hence:

$$A_t = f(eng, trd, crd) \quad (3)$$

where eng refers to energy consumption per capita, trd refers to trade openness measured by the sum of imports and exports as a percent of GDP, and crd refers to financial development which is proxied by domestic credit to private sectors as a percent of GDP (Odhiambo, 2014). The effects of eng , trd and crd on total factor productivity (TFP) can be captured when these variables are entered as shift variables into the production function. This idea of adding the shift variables (besides capital and labor) was developed by Rao (2010). Subsequently,

$$A_t = A_0 e^{gT} eng_t^\beta trd_t^\theta crd_t^\gamma \quad (4)$$

and

$$y_t = (A_0 e^{gT} eng_t^\beta trd_t^\theta crd_t^\gamma) k_t^\alpha \quad (5)$$

Equation (6) is obtained by transforming equation (5) into natural logarithm and further simplifying it. This is the equation that would be used to estimate long-run relationship once a cointegration relationship is identified.

$$\ln y = \lambda + \alpha \ln k_t + \phi \ln eng_t + \theta \ln trd_t + \gamma \ln crd_t + \pi TB + \varepsilon_t \quad (6)$$

where λ is the constant, α , ϕ , θ , and γ denotes the elasticity coefficient of capital per worker ($\ln k$), energy consumption per capita ($\ln eng$), trade openness ($\ln trd$), and financial

1
2
3
4 development ($\ln crd$), respectively, π refers to the coefficient of trend or break period in trend
5
6
7 (TB), and ε_t is the error term.
8
9

10 3.2 Data and method 11

12 The sample data covers the period 1971-2011. The capital stock data is built using the perpetual
13 inventory method where we use the gross fixed capital formation as a proxy for investment.
14 Hence the capital stock, K_t , is defined as $K_t = (1-\delta)K_{t-1} + I_t$, where δ is the depreciation rate and
15 I_t is the investment in constant US dollars. The labour stock (L_t) is estimated from the average
16 employment to population ratio multiplied by the annual population. We used $\delta = 0.07$ and initial
17 K_0 is set as 1.01 times the 1960 constant GDP.² The data on energy use is in kilogram of oil
18 equivalent per capita (eng_t), and the data on gross fixed capital formation (I_t), GDP (Y_t) are in
19 constant 2005 US\$; trade openness (trd_t) is measured by the sum of exports and imports as a
20 percent of GDP, and financial development (crd_t) is measured as the domestic credit as a
21 percent of GDP. The data is sourced from the *World Development Indicators and Global*
22 *Development Finance* database (World Bank, 2014a). The descriptive statistics and correlation
23 matrix is provided in Table 1. As noted, output per worker is highly and positively correlated
24 with capital per worker (0.61), energy (0.58) and trade openness (0.73), respectively. Notably,
25 the correlation between financial development and economic growth is very small albeit positive
26 (0.08). One argument for this is because although the poor have access to financial services in
27 the form of microloans, they cannot use these loans to support growth as usually is expected. The
28 simple reason is the inequality of income and wealth. In this respect South Africa is according to
29 World Bank (2012) one of the most unequal economies, and this prevents the poor from
30 investing in businesses. Using 2011 as a reference year, we note that majority of the citizens earn
31 very low incomes and the economy is suffering from a high degree of inequality with a Gini
32 coefficient of 0.69.³ Moreover, some 20.2 percent of population live below the food poverty line
33 of 321 ZAR (48 USD) per month (10.2 million people), and on total 45.5% live from less than
34 620 ZAR (92 USD) per month (all data are from 2011.) Therefore, the banking sector offers the
35 poor only unsecured microloans with high margins, which are profitable for banks, but rarely
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ² The $\delta = 0.07$ is arbitrarily chosen, so long as the capital per worker exhibits a diminishing returns to scale which is
59 identified through the concavity of the plot of capital per worker.

60 ³ Countries like Fiji and Germany has a Gini coefficient of 0.428 and 0.30, respectively.
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 beneficial for borrowers. Not surprisingly, the majority of these loans are used for consumption
5 purposes or to repay microloans taken out earlier. Moreover, although the ratio of private credits
6 to GDP exceeded 100% since 1992 and reached to 149% in 2013, the household debt to
7
8 disposable income ratio was just 75% in 2013 (SARB, 2013)⁴.
9

10
11
12 <<INSERT TABLE 1 HERE>>
13
14
15

16 A standard procedure in examining the cointegration (the presence of long-run association), is to
17 check the stationarity properties of the series. It is often the case that the series may suffer from
18 unknown structural breaks due to changes in the economic and political environment, and this is
19 not detected using the conventional unit root tests. Moreover, although the ARDL bounds tests
20 (Pesaran et al. 2001) can be applied irrespective of the order of integration, it is important to note
21 that the series are at most integrated of order one. In the presence of a higher order integration,
22 I(2) and above, the computed F-statistics will provide unreliable indicators since the ARDL
23 approach is developed for series with a highest order of integration of one. Moreover, examining
24 the unit root properties provides the maximum order of integration which is important when
25 carrying out the causality assessment. In the standard pair-wise causality assessment, all
26 variables need to be stationary, and using the method proposed by Toda and Yamamoto (1995)
27 for non-Granger causality tests, the maximum lag-length is the sum of the highest order of
28 integration and the lag-length chosen by the AIC/SBC criteria for long-run estimation.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 To examine the unit root properties, we use the conventional Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF),
42 Phillips & Peron (PP) and Kwiatkowski-Phillips-Schmidt-Shin (KPSS) unit root tests,
43 respectively (Table 2), which duly confirm that the maximum order of integration for each series
44 is one. Moreover, we use the Perron (1997) test to detect the unknown single structural break in
45 the series. As noted (Table 3), all variables are stationary at first difference with respective
46 structural breaks in the series.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 <<INSERT TABLE 2 HERE>>
54
55
56
57

58 ⁴ A ratio of 75% is not the problem, but it is a problem that these debts are mostly unsecured loans and that the
59 majority of debtors are extremely poor. According to Bateman (2013), 40% of the workforce's income is spent for
60 repaying debts.
61
62
63
64
65

<<INSERT TABLE 3 HERE>>

The maximum lag-length selected for the ARDL estimation for long-run association and short-run dynamics is 2 ($k = 2$), which is supported by the majority of the lag selection criteria (LR, FPE, AIC) (Table 4).

<<INSERT TABLE 4 HERE>>

3.3 Cointegration results

Next, to examine the long-run association of level variables (cointegration), we use two tests. First, we use the most widely used ARDL procedure (Pesaran et al. 2001) (results provided in Table 5) followed by the combined cointegration test (Table 6) proposed by Bayer and Hank (2013). The latter is a group of cointegration tests of Engle and Granger (1987), Johansen (1995), Boswijk (1994) and Bannerjee et al (1998).

The ARDL approach is used because this procedure is relatively simple and recommended for a small sample size (Pesaran, et al. 2001; Ghatak and Siddiki, 2001; Odhiambo, 2009). Since we do not have prior information about the direction of the long-run relationship between output per worker, capital per worker and energy per capita, we construct the following ARDL equations:

$$\Delta \ln y_t = \beta_{10} + \beta_{11} \ln y_{t-1} + \beta_{12} \ln k_{t-1} + \beta_{13} \ln eng_{t-1} + \beta_{14} \ln trd_{t-1} + \beta_{15} \ln crd_{t-1} + \alpha_{10} TB + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_{11i} \Delta \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{12i} \Delta \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{13i} \Delta \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{14i} \Delta \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{15i} \Delta \ln crd_{t-i} + \varepsilon_{1t} \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta \ln k_t = \beta_{20} + \beta_{21} \ln y_{t-1} + \beta_{22} \ln k_{t-1} + \beta_{23} \ln eng_{t-1} + \beta_{24} \ln trd_{t-1} + \beta_{25} \ln crd_{t-1} + \alpha_{20} TB + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_{21i} \Delta \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{22i} \Delta \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{23i} \Delta \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{24i} \Delta \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{25i} \Delta \ln crd_{t-i} + \varepsilon_{2t} \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta \ln eng_t = \beta_{30} + \beta_{31} \ln y_{t-1} + \beta_{32} \ln k_{t-1} + \beta_{33} \ln eng_{t-1} + \beta_{34} \ln trd_{t-1} + \beta_{35} \ln crd_{t-1} + \alpha_{30} TB + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_{31i} \Delta \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{32i} \Delta \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{33i} \Delta \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{34i} \Delta \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{35i} \Delta \ln crd_{t-i} + \varepsilon_{3t} \quad (9)$$

$$\Delta \ln trd_t = \beta_{40} + \beta_{41} \ln y_{t-1} + \beta_{42} \ln k_{t-1} + \beta_{43} \ln eng_{t-1} + \beta_{44} \ln trd_{t-1} + \beta_{45} \ln crd_{t-1} + \alpha_{40} TB + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_{41i} \Delta \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{42i} \Delta \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{43i} \Delta \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{44i} \Delta \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{45i} \Delta \ln crd_{t-i} + \varepsilon_{4t} \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta \ln crd_t = \beta_{50} + \beta_{51} \ln y_{t-1} + \beta_{52} \ln k_{t-1} + \beta_{53} \ln eng_{t-1} + \beta_{54} \ln trd_{t-1} + \beta_{55} \ln crd_{t-1} + \alpha_{50} TB + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_{51i} \Delta \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{52i} \Delta \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{53i} \Delta \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{54i} \Delta \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \alpha_{55i} \Delta \ln crd_{t-i} + \varepsilon_{5t} \quad (11)$$

According to Bayer and Hank (2013), the combination of the computed significance level (p-value) of individual cointegration tests is specified in the Fisher's formulae as:

$$EG - JOH = -2 [\ln(p_{EG}) + \ln(p_{JOH})] \quad (12)$$

$$EG - JOH - BO - BDM = -2 [\ln(p_{EG}) + \ln(p_{JOH}) + \ln(p_{BO}) + \ln(p_{BDM})] \quad (13)$$

where p_{EG} , p_{JOH} , p_{BO} , and p_{BDM} are the p-values of individual cointegration tests, respectively. If the estimated Fisher statistics exceed the critical values of Bayer and Hank (2013), the null hypothesis of no cointegration is rejected. The results (Table 6) supports cointegration at 5% level of significance for Johansen, EG-Johansen, and EG-J-Banerjee-Boswijk and 10% level for EG and Boswijk, respectively.

As noted, in both tests, the results support a cointegration relationship thereby justifying the existence of long-run association between the variables. Notable, from the ARDL cointegration results, it is clear that the long-run association exists between the variables when output per worker is set as the dependent variables (F -statistics = 6.1654), which is significant at 1% level for the sample size of 45 (critical bound = 5.865), and 5% when the sample size is 40 (critical bound = 4.587). It is important to highlight that the critical bounds statistics used are from Narayan (2005) which is specifically computed for sample size between 30 and 80 with the intervals of 5. The bounds statistics from Pesaran et al (2001) are applicable for a sample size of more than 80. Since our sample size, $n = 41$, and hence $40 < n < 45$, we use the critical bounds of 40 and 45 to make reliable inference on cointegration.

<<INSERT TABLE 5 HERE>>

<<INSERT TABLE 6 HERE>>

Before presenting the ARDL long-run and short-run results, the diagnostic tests are in order.⁵ These tests include: Lagrange multiplier test of residual serial correlation (χ_{sc}^2); Ramsey's RESET test using the square of the fitted values for correct functional form (χ_{ff}^2); normality test based on the test of skewness and kurtosis of residuals (χ_n^2); and heteroscedasticity test based on the regression of squared residuals on squared fitted values (χ_{hc}^2). In what follows (Table 7), we find that the diagnostic test rejects the null hypothesis of the presence of biasness of serial correlation ($\chi_{sc}^2(1) = 0.4878: F(1, 28) = 0.3546$), functional form ($\chi_{ff}^2(1) = 1.2984: F(1, 28) = 0.9643$), normality ($\chi_n^2(2) = 0.7326$) and heteroscedasticity ($\chi_{hc}^2(1) = 0.0472: F(1, 37) = 0.0448$). The CUSUM and CUSUM of squares (CUSUMQ) figures are examined to determine the stability of the parameters of the model (Figures 1a and 1b) and as noted, the plots indicate that parameters are stable in the model.

<<INSERT TABLE 7 HERE>>

<<INSERT FIGURE 1a HERE>>

<<INSERT FIGURE 1b HERE>>

3.4 Regression results – short-run and long-run elasticity coefficients

3.4.1 Short-Run results

As noted from the short-run results (Table 8: Panel b), capital productivity has a mixed result ($\Delta \ln k = 2.6998: t - ratio = 7.4317, \Delta \ln k_{t-1} = -0.8671: t - ratio = -2.8154$), however the net effect is positive (1.8327). As expected, the coefficient of energy consumption per capita is positive ($\Delta \ln eng = 0.2414: t - ratio = 2.6954$) and significant at 1% level of statistical significance. Moreover, we note a positive and statistically significant coefficient of trade openness ($\Delta \ln trd : t - ratio = 2.7060$). However, the coefficient of financial development is negative ($\Delta \ln crd = -0.0328: t - ratio = -3.0306$) and significant at 1% level of statistical significance. Notably, the coefficient of the break period dummy has a marginal positive association ($TB_{\geq 2000} = 0.0114: t - ratio = 1.7016$) indicating the structural changes post 2000 has had marginal albeit a positive contribution to the short-run economic growth. Furthermore,

⁵ The ARDL lag estimation results, which precedes the long-run and short-run estimation is not included here. We only provide the diagnostic tests in order to ascertain the robustness of the long-run and short-run estimated results.

1
2
3
4 the coefficient of the error-correction term ($ECM_{t-1} = -0.8363:t - ratio = -4.7273$) is -0.84
5 and significant at 1% level of significance, thus implying a relatively speedy convergence to the
6 long-run equilibrium. In other words, roughly 84% of the disequilibrium from the previous
7 year's shocks adjusts back to the long-run equilibrium in the current year.
8
9

10
11
12
13 <<INSERT TABLE 8 HERE>>
14

15 3.4.2 Long-Run results

16
17 The long-run results (Table 8: Panel a) provides the long-run elasticity coefficients of the key
18 variables. Notably, the capital share is positive and significant at 1% level of statistical
19 significance ($\ln k = 0.4391:t - ratio = 14.0445$). Moreover, the energy elasticity is positive
20 and significant at 5% level of statistical significance ($\ln eng = 0.2887:t - ratio = 2.4281$), which
21 implies that a 1% increase in energy consumption is likely to increase the output by 0.29%.
22 Notably, the estimation of the energy elasticity is very close to Kumar and Kumar (2013) which
23 find that the long-run elasticity is about 0.34. The plausible reason for a slightly lower elasticity
24 coefficient (0.29) in case of this study is due to the fact that we have included other variables such
25 as trade openness and financial development and hence minimize the issue of omitted variable
26 biasness. As noted, the elasticity coefficient of trade openness is positive
27 ($\ln trd = 0.0519:t - ratio = 1.866$) and statistically significant at 10% level. Hence, a 1%
28 increase in trade activity (measured by import + exports as a percent of GDP) results in roughly a
29 0.05% increase of the output per worker. On the other hand, we note that the elasticity coefficient
30 of financial development (measured by domestic credit as a percent of GDP) is negative
31 ($\ln crd = -0.0393$) and significant at 1% level of statistical significance. The negative coefficient
32 indicates that financial development has a marginal growth-impeding effect in the economy. This
33 is plausible in the presence of poor and/lack of allocation of funds to productive economic
34 activities, and poor access of key financial services. Similar to the short-run results, we note that
35 the coefficient of the post-2000 break in series dummy is positive
36 ($TB_{\geq 2000} = 0.0172:t - ratio = 1.7356$) association with the long-run output level.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 While the results mentioned above give some insights into the impact of trade openness, energy,
57 and financial development, they need to be interpreted within caveats. Using the augmented
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Cobb-Douglas model, where capital per worker is a critical input in the production function to
5
6 examine the impacts of shift parameters on the output per worker, we note that the long-run
7
8 coefficient of the capital per worker (capital share) is slightly higher than the stylized value of
9
10 one-third (Rao 2007; Ertur and Koch 2007). Although the relatively high capital share is not a
11
12 problem for an economy which is on its path to growth, the reasons for this can vary. Among
13
14 some notable reasons include: when the quality of data and the small sample size which makes it
15
16 difficult to compute the capital stock (Bosworth and Collins 2008) that can ideally exhibit
17
18 decreasing returns to scale and thus conform to a desirable steady-state convergence.; when the
19
20 capital and labour inputs tend to grow at relatively similar rates; when a significant share of the
21
22 labour force earn its income in the shadow economy; when there is a large number of self-
23
24 employed persons who earn income from both capital and their own labour (Gollin 2002) thus
25
26 making it difficult to obtain meaningful measures of income shares. We agree that the positive or
27
28 negative coefficient of financial development is somewhat sensitive to the choice of the proxy
29
30 used (Khan and Senhadji 2003; Odhiambo 2007, 2014; Menyah et al., 2014).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *3.5 The Toda-Yamamoto approach to Granger non-causality test*

41 Next, to give further merit to the cointegration results and the estimations of short-run and long-
42
43 run results, the Granger causality test using the Toda-Yamamoto (1995) approach is carried out.
44
45 The Toda and Yamamoto (1995) provides a method to test for the presence of non-causality
46
47 irrespective of whether the variables are $I(0)$, $I(1)$ or $I(2)$, not cointegrated or cointegrated of an
48
49 arbitrary order. In the presence of mixed order of integration, the error-correction method cannot
50
51 be applied for Granger causality and the standard (pair-wise) Granger causality test will require
52
53 that all series used are strictly stationary. Hence, opting for the Toda and Yamamoto (1995)
54
55 procedure, the causality model is set-up in the following VAR system:
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$$\ln y_t = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_{1i} \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \alpha_{2j} \ln y_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \eta_{1i} \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \eta_{2j} \ln k_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_{1i} \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \phi_{2j} \ln eng_{t-j} + \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \delta_{1i} \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \delta_{2j} \ln trd_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_{1i} \ln crd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \sigma_{2j} \ln crd_{t-j} + \lambda_{1t}$$

$$\ln k_t = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_{1i} \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \beta_{2j} \ln k_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{1i} \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \theta_{2j} \ln y_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \vartheta_{1i} \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \vartheta_{2j} \ln eng_{t-j} + \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \nu_{1i} \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \nu_{2j} \ln trd_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \tau_{1i} \ln crd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \tau_{2j} \ln crd_{t-j} + \lambda_{2t}$$

$$\ln eng_t = \gamma_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_{1i} \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \gamma_{2j} \ln eng_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \varphi_{1i} \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \varphi_{2j} \ln y_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_{1i} \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \mu_{2j} \ln k_{t-j} + \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \kappa_{1i} \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \kappa_{2j} \ln trd_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{1i} \ln crd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \xi_{2j} \ln crd_{t-j} + \lambda_{3t}$$

$$\ln trd_t = \pi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_{1i} \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \pi_{2j} \ln trd_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \rho_{1i} \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \rho_{2j} \ln y_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \omega_{1i} \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \omega_{2j} \ln k_{t-j} + \quad (17)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \psi_{1i} \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \psi_{2j} \ln eng_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \zeta_{1i} \ln crd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \zeta_{2j} \ln crd_{t-j} + \lambda_{4t}$$

$$\ln crd_t = \sigma_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_{1i} \ln crd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \sigma_{2j} \ln crd_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \varpi_{1i} \ln y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \varpi_{2j} \ln y_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \chi_{1i} \ln k_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \chi_{2j} \ln k_{t-j} + \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{1i} \ln eng_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \lambda_{2j} \ln eng_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_{1i} \ln trd_{t-i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{d \max} \beta_{2j} \ln trd_{t-j} + \lambda_{5t}$$

where the series are defined in (14)-(18). The null hypothesis of no-causality is rejected when the p-values fall within the desired 1-10 percent of level of significance. Hence, in (14), Granger causality running from k, eng, trd and crd to y , implies $\eta_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\phi_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\delta_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, and $\sigma_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, respectively. Similarly, in (15), y, eng, trd and crd Granger causes k if $\theta_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\vartheta_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\nu_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, and $\tau_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, respectively; in (16) y, k, trd and crd Granger causes eng if $\varphi_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\mu_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\kappa_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, and $\xi_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, respectively; in (17), y, k, eng , and crd Granger causes trd if $\rho_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\omega_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\psi_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, and $\zeta_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, respectively; and finally in (18) y, k, eng , and trd Granger causes crd if $\varpi_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\chi_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, $\lambda_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, and $\beta_{1i} \neq 0 \forall i$, respectively.

From the unit root results (Table 2 and 3), we note that the maximum order of integration is 1 ($d_{max} = 1$), and the optimal lag length (k) chosen is 2 (Table 4). Hence the maximum lags (l) that can be used to carry out the non-causality tests is 3 ($l = d_{max} + k \leq 3$). Hence, we take $l = 2$ and note that this lag-length also ensures that the causality model is dynamically stable,

1
2
3
4 that is, the inverse roots of the AR (auto-regressive) characteristics polynomial lies within the
5 positive and negative unity, $|I_R| \leq 1$. The results are presented in Table 9.
6
7
8

9
10 We note a bi-directional causation between trade openness and output per worker
11 ($\ln y \rightarrow \ln trd: \chi^2 = 10.3198; \ln y \leftarrow \ln trd: \chi^2 = 10.3319$) at 5% level of statistical
12 significance; and a unidirectional causality running from energy per capita to output per worker
13 ($\ln eng \rightarrow \ln y: \chi^2 = 12.8108$), capital per worker to output per worker
14 ($\ln k \rightarrow \ln y: \chi^2 = 18.2214$) and capital per worker to trade openness
15 ($\ln k \rightarrow \ln trd: \chi^2 = 14.6222$) at 1% level of statistical significance, respectively.
16
17 Subsequently, the causality results indicate a mutually reinforcing (feedback) effect between
18 trade openness and output; capital productivity (investment) and energy per capita cause output
19 (Kumar and Kumar, 2013); and capital productivity cause trade activities. We do not find any
20 causality between financial development and economic growth and/or trade openness. While our
21 findings show no causality between financial development and trade openness similar to Menyah
22 et al (2014), however, it differs in regard to a unidirectional causality detected in the latter which
23 runs from financial development to economic growth in South Africa. Moreover, our study
24 supports a bi-directional causality between trade openness and output per worker whereas
25 Menyah et al. (2014) find a unidirectional causality from trade openness to economic growth. In
26 examining the combined or ‘conjoint’ effect, we note that the ‘combined force’ of capital
27 productivity, energy and trade openness jointly cause output per worker
28 ($\ln k \times \ln eng \times \ln trd \rightarrow \ln y: \chi^2 = 31.2599$); and output per worker and capital productivity
29 jointly cause trade activities ($\ln y \times \ln y \rightarrow \ln trd: \chi^2 = 38.4310$) at 1% level of significance,
30 respectively.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

<<INSERT TABLE 9 HERE>>

53 **4. Discussion**

54 Notably, the results presented in the paper resonate with as well as contrasts to with some earlier
55 studies in few respects. For instance, the unidirectional causation running from energy to output
56 is similar to Odhiambo (2010) and Kumar and Kumar (2013). Notably, the estimated energy
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 elasticity coefficient is slightly lower than Kumar and Kumar (2013) since we included other
5 variables to minimize omitted variable biasness and hence the risk of overestimating the
6 coefficient. The negative coefficient of financial development contrast to Polat et al. (2014)
7 which find relatively high positive coefficient of financial development (0.31) in the long-run
8 and a negative but not statistically significant coefficient in the short-run. Unlike Polat et al.
9 (2014) and Menyah et al (2014) which find that financial development cause output, and
10 Odhiambo (2010) which find reverse causality, our results show of any such causality between
11 financial development and output. Interestingly, we note a positive coefficient of financial
12 development both in the short-run and the long-run which is contrast to Polat et al. (2014) which
13 find a mixed outcome – positive in the short-run and negative in the long-run, with a very low
14 error correction term. We contend that trade is an important part of South Africa’s growth and
15 development, and hence research to suss out the impact of trade needs to be assessed with care.
16 At best, our results coincide with regard to financial development and trade openness with some
17 recent studies (Demetriades and James 2011; Chang and Mendy 2012).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Additionally, we have to reiterate that the poorest 30% of the population does not actively
42 participate in the financial sector development in South Africa because most of them do not have
43 access to financial services. One argument is that it is except microloans with over-proportional
44 high margins unprofitable for financial institutions to offer their services to the 30% of the
45 poorest citizens. However, we argue that appropriate financial infrastructures such as mobile
46 technology, road and transport services, and soft infrastructures such as financial literacy,
47 regulations and ethics of borrowing, socio-economic importance and culture of saving, etc. can
48 greatly reduce the barriers to financial inclusivity. The weak (and/or missing) links between
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 financial sector and small and medium enterprises therefore may be one of the reasons why
5
6 financial sector is weakly correlated with and subsequently have negative impact on growth in
7
8 South Africa despite the fact that the economy is classified as an upper middle income country.
9
10 Additionally, it must be stated that the private credits to GDP ratio is likely above the level that
11
12 the financial sector can contribute to growth measured by this indicator. Moreover, we also note
13
14 that this indicator incorporates the weakness that a too high ratio leads probably to an economic
15
16 decline rather than to economic growth, which in large part can be due to the credit being
17
18 channelled into non-income generating and consumption activities, which coupled with growing
19
20 unemployment, increases the odds of default and wastage of economic resources. A second
21
22 weakness is generated by the fact that we do not know precisely the purpose or use of these
23
24 credits. If they are only used for consumption purposes, then the outcome will probably be
25
26 growth-retarding if not growth-reducing.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Moreover, it is not sufficient that the poor have access to financial services. In addition, the
37
38 government may consider how the poor citizens can participate in the economic development
39
40 process of South Africa to reduce the income inequality and ensure that the share of the people
41
42 who live below the poverty line are given the opportunity to be part of the thriving economic
43
44 prosperity of South Africa.
45
46
47
48
49

50 With regard to energy, we note that because of the fact that the electricity and energy supply is
51
52 crucial for South Africa's economy and the fact that the state-governed companies and especially
53
54 Eskom are not able to guarantee a continuous and sufficient supply of electricity since 2007,
55
56 policies to re-regulate the market for electricity may need to be re-visited (Deloitte 2012). While
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 being cautious of environmental sustainability, it is equally pertinent to note that excessive
5 energy-electricity conservation policies may tend to have a detrimental impact on the economic
6 growth, and therefore as balance need to be maintained. The potential of clean and eco-friendly
7 solar (green) energy to power up and support economic activities can be looked at. In this regard,
8 the production and consumption of electricity/energy, identifying sources of energy and
9 innovative technologies will require putting science, and research and development at the centre
10 of policy discussion.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Moreover, benefits arising from trade can be exploited through greater partnership with regional
24 members both within SSA and outside (including Brazil, India, and China) whilst ensuring that
25 small and medium enterprises are given the necessary and conducive environment. The role of
26 appropriate institutions to guard property rights and accessibility to and channel of resources
27 including funds to active and potentially promising business firms will be vital.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Improving capital intensity (capital per worker) and labour productivity is becoming a global
39 concern as countries walk towards sustaining growth. South Africa as an emerging and
40 industrialising economy is no exception. Hence, scaling up capital productivity through
41 encouraging and attracting domestic and foreign investment in key sectors and the inclusion of
42 information technology as a conduit of development in major areas of economic activities are
43 critical for sustainable growth. The Government of South Africa may need to review its trade in
44 services commitments in the area of financial sector in so far as global trade is concerned.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 scrutinizes the schedule of commitments in the financial sector, it is noted that full commitments
5
6 are not made under certain modes of supply. Specifically, under the sub-sector of banking and
7
8 other financial services, South Africa has made partial commitments under certain modes,
9
10 however, it still has under mode 3 (commercial presence) certain requirements that foreign
11
12 investors will have to fulfil. For example in order to establish banking firm in the country, the
13
14 branches of banks not incorporated in the country is required to maintain a minimum capital
15
16 requirements. In the same vein, the role of financial and technology expansion need to be
17
18 improved if a scale-up effect is to be materialized from trade and energy intensive sectors.
19
20 Access to cost effective financial and technological services including digital banking,
21
22 innovative use of technology in retail and financial services can be some few areas to look at.
23
24 Moreover, re-visiting and reviewing the South Africa's micro-credit model is imperative. As
25
26 much as vigilance and pro-activeness is required in lending and debt recovery, of equal
27
28 importance will be to ensure the necessary hard and soft financial and technology infrastructure
29
30 are in place to ensure the credits are used in income-generating projects. Of course, trade
31
32 openness and financial development is an important part of economic development. Hence, to
33
34 ensure sustainability, economic transformations in the economy will require ongoing need to
35
36 improve trade activities and strengthen international relations, and the need to promote small and
37
38 medium enterprises, effective use of energy and technology, and financial inclusion.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **5. Concluding remarks**

50 This paper set out to explore the role of energy and economic growth whilst examining the role
51
52 of trade and financial development in the South Africa over the sample period 1970-2011.
53
54 Furthermore, by including trade openness and financial development, which are critical drivers
55
56 of economic activity in the emerging market of South Africa, we also minimize the chance of
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 over estimating the energy elasticity. The Perron (1997) test is used to control for a single period
5
6 structural break in series. It is noted that there exists a long-run cointegration between the
7
8 variables and that capital per worker, energy and trade openness have positive associations with
9
10 output per worker. We note a bi-directional causation between energy and output. Based on the
11
12 outcomes, we discuss relevant policy matters.
13
14
15
16
17

18 **References**

- 19
20 Abosedra, S. & Baghestani, H. (1989) New evidence on the causal relationship between United States
21 energy consumption and gross national product. *Journal of Energy Development*, 14(2), 285-292.
22
23 Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J.A. (2002) Reversal of Fortune: Geography and Institutions in
24 the Making of the Modern World Income Distribution. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(4),
25 1231-1294.
26
27 Agbetsiafa, D. (2004) The Finance growth nexus: evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Savings and*
28 *Development*, 28(3), 271-288.
29
30 Ahmed, A.D. & Wahid, A.N.M. (2011) Financial structure and economic growth link in African
31 countries: a panel cointegration analysis. *Journal of Economic Studies* 38(3), 331-357 (2011).
32
33 Altinay, G. & Karagol, E. (2004) Structural break, unit root, and the causality between energy
34 consumption and GDP in Turkey. *Energy Economics*, 26(6), 985–994.
35
36 Asafu-Adjaye, J. (2000) The relationship between energy consumption, energy prices and economic
37 growth: time series evidence from Asian developing countries. *Energy Economics*, 22(6), 615–625.
38
39 Atindéhou, R.B., Gueyie, J.P. & Kossi, E. (2005) Financial intermediation and economic growth:
40 evidence from Western Africa. *Applied Financial Economics*, 15(11), 777-790.
41
42 Bannerjee, A., Dolado, J. & Mestre, R. (1998) Error correction mechanism tests for co-integration in
43 single equation framework. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 19(3), 267–283.
44
45 Barro, R.J. & Sala-i-Martin, X. (1997) Technological diffusion, convergence, and growth. *Journal of*
46 *Economic Growth*, 2(1), 1-26.
47
48 Bateman, M. (2013) Microcredit has been a disaster for the poorest in South Africa, *The Guardian*,
49 Tuesday 19 November 2013, 10.55 GMT, <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2013/nov/19/microcredit-south-africa-loans-disaster> , accessed: 14 May 2015
50
51 Bayer, C. & Hanck, C. (2013) Combining non-cointegration tests. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 34(1),
52 83–95.
53
54 Beck, T., Levine, R. & Loayza, N. (2000) Finance and the Sources of Growth. *Journal of Financial*
55 *Economics*, 58(1), 261-300.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Boswijk, H.P. (1994) Testing for an unstable root in conditional and unconditional error correction
5 models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 63(1), 37–60.
6
- 7 Bosworth, B. & Collins, S.M. (2008) Accounting for Growth: Comparing China and India. *Journal of*
8 *Economic Perspectives*, 22(1), 45–66.
9
- 10 Chang C-C & Mendy, M. (2012) Economic growth and openness in Africa: What is the empirical
11 relationship?. *Applied Economics Letters*, 19(18), 1903-1907.
12
- 13 Christopoulos, D. K. & Tsionas, E. G. (2004) Financial development and economic growth: evidence
14 from panel unit root and cointegration tests. *Journal of development Economics*, 73(1), 55-74.
15
- 16 Coe, D.T. & Helpman, E. (1995) International R&D Spillovers. *European Economic Review*, 39(5), 850-
17 887.
18
- 19 Deloitte (2012) The Economic Impact of Electricity Price Increases on Various Sectors of the South
20 African Economy – A consolidated view based on the findings of existing research. Eskom.
21 Johannesburg, South Africa.
22 [www.eskom.co.za/CustomerCare/MYPD3/Documents/Economic_Impact_of_Electricity_Price_Increases_](http://www.eskom.co.za/CustomerCare/MYPD3/Documents/Economic_Impact_of_Electricity_Price_Increases_Document1.pdf)
23 [Document1.pdf](http://www.eskom.co.za/CustomerCare/MYPD3/Documents/Economic_Impact_of_Electricity_Price_Increases_Document1.pdf) [Accessed: 25 August, 2014]
24
- 25 Demetriades, P.O. & James, G.A. (2011) Finance and growth in Africa: The broken link. *Economic*
26 *Letters*, 113(3), 263-265.
27
- 28 Engle, R.F. & Granger, C. (1987) Cointegration and error correction representation: estimation and
29 testing. *Econometrica*, 55(2), 251–276.
30
- 31 Erol, U. & Yu, E. S. (1987) On the causal relationship between energy and income for industrialized
32 countries. *Journal of Energy and Development*, 13(1), 113-122.
33
- 34 Ertur, C. & Koch, W. (2007) Growth, Technological Interdependence and spatial externalities: Theory
35 and Evidence. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 22(6), 1033-1062.
36
- 37 Fowowe, B. (2011) The finance-growth nexus in Sub-Saharan Africa: Panel cointegration and causality
38 tests. *Journal of International Development*, 32(2), 220-239.
39
- 40 Galor, O. & Mountford, A. (2006) Trade and the great divergence: the family connection. *American*
41 *Economic Review*, 96(2), 299-303.
42
- 43 Ghali, K.H. & El-Sakka, M.I.T. (2004) Energy use and output growth in Canada: a multivariate
44 cointegration analysis. *Energy Economics*, 26(2), 225–238.
45
- 46 Ghatak, S. & Siddiki, J. (2001) The use of ARDL approach in estimating virtual exchange rates in India.
47 *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 28(5), 573–583.
48
- 49 Ghirmay T. (2004) Financial Development and Economic Growth in Sub-Saharan African Countries:
50 Evidence from Time Series Analysis. *African Development Review*, 16(3), 415-432.
51
- 52 Glasure, Y.U. & Lee, A-R. (1998) Cointegration, error-correction, and the relationship between GDP and
53 energy: The case of South Korea and Singapore. *Resource and Energy Economics*, 20(1), 17-25.
54
- 55 Goldsmith, R.W. (1969) *Financial structure and development (Vol. 1)*. Yale University Press New Haven.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Gollin, D. (2002) Getting Income Shares Right. *Journal of Political Economy*, 110(2), 458–474.
5
6 Gries, T., Kraft, M. & Meierrieks, D. (2009) Linkages Between Financial Deepening, Trade Openness,
7 and Economic Development: Causality Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *World Development*, 37(12),
8 1849-1860.
9
10 Grossman, G.M. & Helpman, E.H. (1990) Comparative advantage and long-run growth. *American*
11 *Economic Review*, 80(4), 796-81.
12
13 Grossman, G.M. & Helpman, E.H. (1991) Innovation and growth in the global economy. Cambridge:
14 MIT Press.
15
16 Hassan, M.K., Sanchez, B. & Yu, J-S. (2011) Financial development and economic growth: New
17 evidence from panel data. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 51(1), 88-104.
18
19 Howitt, P. (2000) Endogenous growth and cross-country income differences. *American Economic*
20 *Review*, 90(4), 829-846.
21
22 Huang, B-N., Hwang, M.J. & Yang, C.W. (2008) Causal relationship between energy consumption and
23 GDP growth revisited: A dynamic panel data approach. *Ecological Economics*, 67(1), 41-54.
24
25 Hye, Q.M.A. & Dolgoplova, I. (2011) Economics, finance and development in China: Johansen-Juselius
26 co-integration approach. *Chinese Management Studies*, 5(3), 311-324.
27
28 Johansen, S. (1995) A statistical analysis of cointegration for $i(2)$ variables. *Economic Theory*, 11(1), 25-
29 59.
30
31 Jouini, J. (2014) Linkage between international trade and economic growth in GCC countries: Empirical
32 evidence from PMG estimation approach. *The Journal of International Trade and Economic*
33 *Development*. DOI: 10.1080/09638199.2014.904394 .
34
35 Khan, M. & Senhadji, A. (2003) Financial development and economic growth: A review and new
36 evidence. *Journal of African Economies*, 12, ii89–ii110.
37
38 King, R.G. & Levine, R. (1993a) Finance and growth: Schumpeter might be right. *Quarterly Journal of*
39 *Economics*, 108(3), 717-737.
40
41 King, R.G. & Levine, R. (1993b) Finance, entrepreneurship, and growth: Theory and evidence. *Journal of*
42 *Monetary Economics*, 32(3), 513-542.
43
44 Kraft, J. & Kraft, A. (1978) On the relationship between energy and GNP. *Journal of Energy and*
45 *Development* 3, 401–403.
46
47 Kumar, R.R. & Kumar, R. (2013) Effects of energy consumption on per worker output: A study of Kenya
48 and South Africa. *Energy Policy*, 62, 1167-1193.
49
50 Kumar, R.R. (2012) Exploring the interactive effects of remittances, financial development and ICT in
51 Sub-Saharan Africa: an ARDL bounds approach. *African Journal of Economic and Sustainable*
52 *Development*, 1(3), 214-242.
53
54 Kumar, R.R., Stauvermann, P.J. & Patel, A. (2015) Nexus between electricity consumption and economic
55 growth: a study of Gibraltar. *Economic Change and Restructuring*, 48(2), 119-135.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Kumar, R.R., Stauvermann, P.J., Patel, A. & Kumar, R.D. (2014) Exploring the effects of energy
5 consumption on output per worker: A study of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. *Energy Policy*,
6 69, 575-585.
7
8
9 Lee, C.C. (2006) The causality relationship between energy consumption and GDP in G-11 countries
10 revisited. *Energy Policy*, 34, 1086-1093.
11
12 Lee, C-C. (2005) Energy consumption and GDP in developing countries: A cointegrated panel analysis.
13 *Energy Economics*, 27(3), 415-427.
14
15 Leibbrandt, M., Woolard, I., Finn, A. & Argent, J. (2010) Trends in South African Income Distribution
16 and Poverty since the Fall of Apartheid. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No.
17 101, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kmms0t7p1ms-en> [Accessed: 15 September, 2014]
18
19 Levine, R. & Zervos, S. (1998) Stock markets, banks, and economic growth. *American Economic*
20 *Review*, 88(3), 537-558.
21
22 Levine, R. (1997) Financial development and economic growth: views and agenda. *Journal of Economic*
23 *Literature*, 35(2), 688-726.
24
25 Mahadevan, R. & Asafu-Adjaye, J. (2007) Energy consumption, economic growth and prices: A
26 reassessment using panel VECM for developed and developing countries. *Energy Policy*. 35(4), 2481-
27 2490.
28
29 Masih, A. & Masih, R. (1996) Energy consumption, real income and temporal causality: Results from a
30 multi-country study based on cointegration and error-correction modeling techniques. *Energy Economics*,
31 18(3), 165–183.
32
33 McKinnon, R. I. (1973) Money and capital in economic development. Brookings Institution Press.
34
35 Menyah, K., Nazilioglu, S. & Wolde-Rufael, Y. (2014) Financial development, trade openness and
36 economic growth in African countries: New insights from a panel causality approach. *Economic*
37 *Modelling*, 37, 386-394.
38
39 Narayan, P.K. & Smyth, R. (2005) Electricity consumption, employment and real income in Australia:
40 evidence from multivariate Granger causality tests. *Energy Policy*, 33(9), 1109–1116.
41
42 Neusser, K. & Kugler, M. (1998) Manufacturing growth and financial development: Evidence from
43 OECD countries. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 80(4), 638-646.
44
45 Ockwell, D.G. (2008) Energy and economic growth: Grounding our understanding in physical reality.
46 *Energy Policy*, 36(12), 4600-4604.
47
48 Odhiambo, N.M. (2007) Supply-leading versus Demand-following Hypothesis: Empirical Evidence from
49 Three SSA Countries. *African Development Review*, 19(2), 257-280.
50
51 Odhiambo, N.M. (2009) Energy consumption and economic growth nexus in Tanzania: An ARDL
52 bounds testing approach. *Energy Policy*, 37(2), 617-622.
53
54 Odhiambo, N.M. (2010) Energy consumption, prices and economic growth in three SSA countries: A
55 comparative study. *Energy Policy*, 38(5), 2463-2469.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Odhiambo, N.M. (2010) Finance-investment-growth nexus in South Africa: an ARDL bounds testing
5 approach. *Economic Change and Restructuring*, 43(3), 205-219.
6
7 Odhiambo, N.M. (2014) Financial systems and economic growth in South Africa: a dynamic
8 complementarity test. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 28(1), 83-101.
9
10 Oh, W. & Lee, K. (2004a) Energy consumption and economic growth in Korea: testing the causality
11 relation. *Journal of Policy Modeling* 26(8-9), 973-981 (2004a).
12
13 Oh, W. & Lee, K. (2004b) Causal relationship between energy consumption and GDP revisited: the case
14 of Korea 1970–1999. *Energy Economics* 26(1), 51-59.
15
16 Payne, J.E. (2010) A Survey of the Electricity Consumption-Growth Literature. *Applied Energy*. 87(3),
17 723-731.
18
19 Perera, N. & Paudel, R.C. (2009) Financial development and economic growth in Sri Lanka. *Applied*
20 *Econometrics and International Development*, 9(1), 157-164 (2009).
21
22 Perron, P. (1997) Further evidence on breaking trend functions in macroeconomic variables. *Journal of*
23 *Econometrics*, 80, 355-385.
24
25 Pesaran, M.H., Shin, Y. & Smith, R.J. (2001) Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of level
26 relationships. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 16(3), 289–326 (2001).
27
28 Polat, A., Shahbaz, M., Rehman, I.U. & Satti, S.L. (2014) Revisiting linkages between financial
29 development, trade openness and economic growth in South Africa: fresh evidence from combined
30 cointegration test. *Quality & Quantity*. DOI: 10.1007/s11135-014-0023-x.
31
32 Rao, B.B. (2007) Estimating short and long-run relationships: a guide for the applied economist. *Applied*
33 *Economics*, 39(13), 613–1625.
34
35 Rao, B.B. (2010) Estimates of the steady state growth rates for selected Asian countries with an extended
36 Solow Model. *Economic Modelling*, 27(1), 46–53.
37
38 Redding, S. (1999) Dynamic Comparative Advantage and the Welfare Effects of Trade. *Oxford*
39 *Economic Papers*, 51(1), 15-39.
40
41 Rivera-Batiz, L.A. & Romer, P.M. (1991) Economic integration and endogenous growth. *Quarterly*
42 *Journal of Economics*. 106(2), 531-555.
43
44 Rivera-Batiz, L.A. & Romer, P.M. (1994) Economic Integration and endogenous growth. An addendum.
45 *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(1), 307-308.
46
47 Romer, P.M. (1986) Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(5),
48 1002-1037.
49
50 Rousseau, P.L. & Wachtel, P. (1998) Financial intermediation and economic performance: historical
51 evidence from five industrialized countries. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 30(4), 657-678.
52
53 Sari, R., Ewing, B.T. & Soytas, U. (2008) The relationship between disaggregate energy consumption and
54 industrial production in the United States: An ARDL approach. *Energy Economics*, 30(5), 2302-2313.
55
56 Schumpeter, J.A. (1911) *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Shahbaz, M., Hye, Q.M.A., Tiwari, A.K. & Leita, N.C. (2013b) Economic growth, energy consumption,
5 financial development, international trade and CO2 emissions in Indonesia. *Renewable and Sustainable*
6 *Energy Reviews*, 25, 109-121.
7
8 Shahbaz, M., Khan, S. & Tahi, M.I. (2013a) The dynamic links between energy consumption, economic
9 growth, financial development and trade in China: Fresh evidence from multivariate framework analysis.
10 *Energy Economics*, 40, 8-21.
11
12 Shan, J. & Jianhong, Q. (2006) Does Financial Development 'Lead' Economic Growth? The Case of
13 China. *Annals of Economics and Finance*, 7(1), 197-216 (2006).
14
15 Shaw, E.S. (1973) *Financial deepening in economic development*. Oxford University Press, New York.
16 N.Y.
17
18 Solow, R.M. (1956): A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *Quarterly Journal of*
19 *Economics*, 70(1), 65-94.
20
21 South African Reserve Bank (2013) *Quarterly Economic Review*, Quarterly Bulletin 270, 1-75
22
23 Soytas, U. & Sari, R. (2003) Energy consumption and GDP: causality relationship in G-7 countries and
24 emerging markets. *Energy Economics*, 25(1), 33-37.
25
26 Soytas, U. & Sari, R. (2006) Can China contribute more to the fight against global warming?. *Journal of*
27 *Policy Modeling*, 28(8), 837-846.
28
29 Stern, D.I. (1993) Energy and economic growth in the USA, a multivariate approach. *Energy Economics*
30 15(2), 137-150.
31
32 Stern, D.I. (2000) A multivariate cointegration analysis of the role of energy in the US economy. *Energy*
33 *Economics*, 22(2), 267-283.
34
35 Toda, H.Y. & Yamamoto, T. (1995) Statistical inferences in vector autoregression with possibly
36 integrated processes. *Journal of Econometrics*, 66(1-2), 225-250 (1995).
37
38 Ventura, J. (1997) Growth and Interdependence. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(1), 57-84.
39
40 Wacziarg, R. & Welch, K.H. (2008) Trade liberalization and growth: new evidence. *World Bank*
41 *Economic Review*, 22(2), 187-231.
42
43 Wolde-Rufael, Y. (2004) Disaggregated energy consumption and GDP, the experience of Shanghai 1952-
44 1999. *Energy Economics*, 26(1), 69-75.
45
46 Wolde-Rufael, Y. (2005) Energy demand and economic growth: the African experience 19 countries.
47 *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 27(8), 891-903.
48
49 Wolde-Rufael, Y. (2006) Electricity consumption and economic growth: a time series experience for 17
50 African countries. *Energy Policy*, 34(10), 1106-1114.
51
52 Wolde-Rufael, Y. (2009) Re-examining the financial development and economic growth nexus in Kenya.
53 *Economic Modelling*, 26(6), 1140-1146.
54
55 World Bank (2012) *South Africa- Economic Update: Focus on Inequality of Opportunity*, July 2012,
56 Issue 3, Washington D.C.: World Bank
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

World Bank (2013) South Africa- Economic Update: Focus on Financial Inclusion. May 2013, Issue 4, Washington D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank (2014b) South Africa- Economic Update: Focus on Export Competiveness. February 2014, Issue 5, Washington D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. (2014a) World Development Indicators and Global Development Finance. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Yenokyan, K., Seater, J.J. & Arabashi, M. (2014) Economic growth with trade in factors of production. *International Economic Review* 55(1), 223-254.

Yu, E.S.H. & Hwang, B.K. (1984) The relationship between energy and GNP: further results. *Energy Economics* 6(3), 186–190.

Figure 1a




Figure 1b




Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix

	<i>ln y</i>	<i>ln k</i>	<i>ln eng</i>	<i>ln trd</i>	<i>ln crd</i>
<i>Mean</i>	8.5172	9.8604	6.1112	3.9574	4.4522
<i>Median</i>	8.5114	9.8558	6.1122	3.9730	4.2647
<i>Maximum</i>	8.6692	10.1067	6.1780	4.3151	5.0091
<i>Minimum</i>	8.4057	9.5540	6.0642	3.6544	3.8881
<i>Std. Dev.</i>	0.0712	0.1120	0.0254	0.1429	0.3694
<i>Skewness</i>	0.4295	-0.3141	0.6736	-0.1007	0.1887
<i>Kurtosis</i>	2.3921	3.6850	3.4453	2.9902	1.3955
<i>Jarque-Bera</i>	1.8920	1.4756	3.4391	0.0694	4.6413
<i>Probability</i>	0.3883	0.4782	0.1792	0.9659	0.0982
<i>ln y</i>	1.0000	-	-	-	-
<i>ln k</i>	0.6065	1.0000	-	-	-
<i>ln eng</i>	0.5813	0.3822	1.0000	-	-
<i>ln trd</i>	0.7286	0.2876	0.3611	1.0000	-
<i>ln crd</i>	0.0750	0.1960	0.1551	0.2108	1.0000

Notes: *ln y* = log of output per worker (*y*), *ln k* = log of capital per work (*k*), *ln eng* = log of energy consumption (kg) per capita (*eng*), *ln trd* = log of exports + imports as a percent of GDP (*eng*); *ln crd* = domestic credit as a percent of GDP (*crd*). N = 41 (1971-2011).

Table 2: Unit root tests results

Variables in log form	[Intercept]		[Intercept & Trend]	
	Level	1 st Diff.	Level	1 st Diff.
Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF)				
<i>ln y</i>	-0.9242 [1]	-3.9662 [0] ^{***}	-0.9202 [1]	-4.0674 [0] ^{**}
<i>ln k</i>	-1.0809 [3]	-2.0234 [1]	-2.0406 [3]	-1.9156 [1]
<i>ln eng</i>	-1.1062 [0]	-5.2246 [0] ^{***}	-1.2431 [0]	-5.4159 [0] ^{***}
<i>ln trd</i>	-1.8961 [0]	-5.7826 [0] ^{***}	-1.9298 [0]	-5.1447 [2] ^{***}
<i>ln crd</i>	-0.2335 [0]	-5.0538 [1] ^{***}	-2.5599 [0]	-5.0187 [1] ^{***}
Phillips & Peron (PP)				
<i>ln y</i>	-0.5177 [2]	-3.9791 [2] ^{***}	-0.4577 [1]	-3.9534 [4] ^{**}
<i>ln k</i>	-2.0651 [5]	-1.7597 [1]	-2.1122 [5]	-1.4385 [5]
<i>ln eng</i>	-1.1062 [0]	-5.2108 [3] ^{***}	-1.4666 [1]	-5.3643 [4] ^{***}
<i>ln trd</i>	-1.9031 [4]	-6.0503 [16] ^{***}	-1.9351 [4]	-6.1941 [17] ^{***}
<i>ln crd</i>	-0.2743 [3]	-4.8178 [5] ^{***}	-2.5921 [3]	-4.7502 [5] ^{***}
Kwiatkowski-Phillips-Schmidt-Shin (KPSS)				
<i>ln y</i>	0.1555 [5] ^{***}	0.2978 [2] ^{***}	0.1524 [5] [*]	0.1643 [1] [*]
<i>ln k</i>	0.2602 [4] ^{***}	0.2040 [5] ^{***}	0.1135 [5] ^{***}	0.1965 [5] [*]
<i>ln eng</i>	0.1536 [4] ^{***}	0.1821 [2] ^{***}	0.1297 [4] ^{***}	0.0667 [3] ^{***}
<i>ln trd</i>	0.1872 [4] ^{***}	0.1358 [14] ^{***}	0.1648 [4] [*]	0.1382 [15] ^{**}
<i>ln crd</i>	0.7171 [5]	0.1621 [3] ^{***}	0.1422 [4] ^{**}	0.1166 [4] ^{***}

Notes: The ADF and PP critical values are based on Mackinnon (1996) and KPSS are based on Kwiatkowski et al (1992). The optimal lag based on the Akaike Information Criterion for ADF and bandwidth for PP and KPSS are automatically determined by Eviews 8. The null hypothesis for ADF and Phillips-Perron tests is that a series has a unit root (non-stationary) and for KPSS, the series is stationary. ***, **, and * denotes 1% . 5% and 10% level of significance at which the respective series are stationary. Source: Author estimation using Eviews 8.

Table 3: Perron (1997) unit root with break

Variables	Level		First difference	
	PP-stat	T_B	PP-stat	T_B
<i>ln y</i>	-3.517	2000	-5.007**	1987
<i>ln k</i>	-1.942	2004	-5.543*	1992
<i>ln eng</i>	-3.047	2005	-5.720*	2001
<i>ln trd</i>	-3.344	1994	-6.177*	1983
<i>ln crd</i>	-3.448	1979	-5.519**	1995

Notes: T_B = break period. ** and * represent significant at 5% and 10% level of significance. All estimations are with trend.

Table 4: Lag length selection

Lag	LL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
0	272.8157	-	6.77e-13	-13.8324	-13.4015	-13.6791
1	466.7702	316.4520	9.50e-17	-22.7248	-21.2164***	-22.1881***
2	498.0178	42.7599***	7.48e-17***	-23.0536***	-20.4679	-22.1336
3	520.6657***	25.0312	1.06e-16	-22.9298	-19.2668	-21.6265

Notes: *** maximum statistics to identify the corresponding lag-length. LR: sequential modified LR test statistic, FPE: Final prediction error, AIC: Akaike information criterion, SC: Schwarz information criterion, and HQ: Hannan-Quinn information criterion.

Table 5: ARDL Co-integration results

Dependent Variable	Break Period	Computed F-statistic
<i>ln y</i>	$T_{B_y} = 1: 2000-2011$	6.1654***, **
<i>ln k</i>	$T_{B_k} = 1: 2004-2011$	2.7706
<i>ln eng</i>	$T_{B_{eng}} = 1: 2005-2011$	1.3602
<i>ln trd</i>	$T_{B_{trd}} = 1: 1994-2011$	0.4176
<i>ln crd</i>	$T_{B_{crd}} = 1: 1979-2011$	2.8800
Critical Bounds at 1% level		
N	LB = 4.763	UB = 6.200
40	LB = 4.628	UB = 5.865
45		
Critical Bounds at 5% level		
N	LB: 3.512	UB = 4.587
40		
45		

Notes: Critical values for lower bound (LB) and upper bound (UB) are from Narayan (2005), Critical values for the bounds test: case IV: unrestricted intercept and restricted trend, p.1989; $k = 4$; ***, and ** indicates significance at 1% and 5% levels with sample size referenced at $n = 45$ and $n = 40$, the respectively.

Table 6: Bayer-Hank combines cointegration

Lag length	EG	Johansen	Banerjee	Boswijk	EG-Johansen	EG-J-Banerjee-Boswijk
$k=2$	-4.348* (0.055)	36.280** (0.025)	-3.243 (0.204)	19.613* (0.054)	13.159**	22.153**

Notes: EG-Johansen critical value at 1%, 5% and 10% equals to 15.845, 10.576 and 8.301; EG-J-Baerjee-Boswijk critical value at 1%, 5% and 10% equals to 30.774, 20.143 and 15.938; ** and * refers to 5% and 10% level of significance.

Table 7: Diagnostic tests from the ARDL (1,2,0,1,0) lag estimates

Test Types	LM Version	p-value	F Version	p-value
Serial Correlation	$\chi^2(1) = 0.4878^{***}$	0.485	F(1 28) = 0.3546 ^{***}	0.556
Functional Form	$\chi^2(1) = 1.2984^{***}$	0.255	F(1,28) = 0.9643 ^{***}	0.335
Normality	$\chi^2(2) = 0.7326^{***}$	0.693		
Heteroscedasticity	$\chi^2(1) = 0.0472^{***}$	0.828	F(1, 37) = 0.0448 ^{***}	0.833

Notes: *** indicates rejection of null hypothesis of presence of respective test types at 1% level of significance, respectively

Table 8: Estimated long run coefficients and error correction representation

<i>Panel a: Long-run: Dependent variable Ly_t</i>				<i>Panel b: Short-run: Dependent variable ΔLy_t</i>			
Regressor	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-ratio	Regressor	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-ratio
<i>ln k</i>	0.4391	0.0313	14.0445 ^{***}	$\Delta \ln k$	2.6998	0.3633	7.4317 ^{***}
<i>ln eng</i>	0.2887	0.1189	2.4281 ^{**}	$\Delta \ln k_{t-1}$	-0.8671	0.3080	-2.8154 ^{***}
<i>ln trd</i>	0.0519	0.0278	1.8669 [*]	$\Delta \ln eng_t$	0.2414	0.0896	2.6954 ^{**}
<i>ln crd</i>	-0.0393	0.0108	-3.6455 ^{***}	$\Delta \ln trd_t$	0.0691	0.0256	2.7030 ^{**}
<i>Constant</i>	2.3626	0.6293	3.7543 ^{***}	$\Delta \ln crd_t$	-0.0328	0.0108	-3.0306 ^{***}
<i>TB_{≥2000}</i>	0.0172	0.0099	1.7356 [*]	<i>Constant</i>	1.9759	0.7879	2.5079 ^{**}
				<i>TB_{≥2000}</i>	0.0144	0.0085	1.7016 [*]
				<i>ECM_{t-1}</i>	-0.8363	0.1769	-4.7273 ^{***}
<i>Short-run Dynamics test statistics</i>							
R-Squared			0.8429	R-Bar-Squared			0.7941
S.E. of Regression			0.0112	F-stat. F(7, 31)			22.2225
Mean of Dependent Variable			0.0047	S.D. of Dependent Variable			0.0247
Residual Sum of Squares			0.0036	Equation Log-likelihood			125.6452
Akaike Info. Criterion			115.6452	Schwarz Bayesian Criterion			107.3274
DW-statistic			2.0864	ARDL(1,2,0,1,0)			N = 41

Notes: ***, **, and * = significant at 1%, 5% and 10% level of statistical significance.

Table 9: Granger non-causality test

Excluded variable	Dependent Variable (χ^2)				
	<i>ln y</i>	<i>ln k</i>	<i>ln eng</i>	<i>ln trd</i>	<i>ln crd</i>
<i>ln y</i>	-	5.2225 (0.1562)	1.1090 (0.7749)	10.3198** (0.0160)	0.2279 (0.9730)
<i>ln k</i>	18.2214*** (0.0004)	-	4.139675 (0.2468)	14.6222*** (0.0022)	0.6356 (0.8882)
<i>ln eng</i>	12.8108*** (0.0051)	4.4232 (0.2192)	-	5.9725 (0.1130)	1.0659 (0.7853)
<i>ln trd</i>	10.3319** (0.0159)	4.6915 (0.1958)	1.8896 (0.5956)	-	2.9323 (0.4022)
<i>ln crd</i>	2.47238 (0.4803)	1.0864 (0.7804)	3.2295 (0.3576)	5.1129 (0.1637)	-
<i>Combined</i>	31.2599*** (0.0018)	12.9643 (0.3716)	12.4420 (0.4109)	38.4310*** (0.0001)	9.34425 (0.6733)

Notes: df = 3; ***, **, and * refers to 1%, 5%, and 10% level of significance, respectively; p-values are in the parenthesis. Significance within 1-10% level indicates presence of causality