Growth Accounting for Some Selected Developing, Newly Industrialized and Developed Nations from 1966-2000: A Data Envelopment Analysis

Somesh.K.Mathur[1]

Key Words: Data envelopment analysis, growth accounting, technical efficiency, efficiency change, technological change, capital accumulation, human capital accumulation, kernel smoothing, cross country labor productivity distribution and counterfactual distributions

Abstract

We work out technical efficiency levels of 29 countries consisting of some selected South Asian, East Asian and EU countries using data envelopment analysis. Luxembourg has an efficiency score of one(most efficient) in all the years .Netherlands also has an efficiency score of one in 1966,1971,1976 and 1981.Japan,UK,Belgium,Ireland,Indonesia,Spain and Germany has an efficiency score of one in at least one of the years from 1966 to 2000.In the year 2000 though mean efficiency levels(without including life expectancy as input) of South Asian countries is higher than the European Union Countries and East Asian countries. Japan has the highest average efficiency followed by Hong Kong in the East Asian region in the period 1966-2000.

We also decompose labor productivity growth into components attributable to technological changes (shifts in the overall production frontier), technological catch up or efficiency changes(movement towards or away from the frontier),capital accumulation(movement along the frontier) and human capital accumulation(proxied by life expectancy).The overall production frontier is constructed using deterministic methods requiring no specification of functional form for the technology nor any assumption about market structure or the absence of market imperfections. Growth accounting results tend to convey that for the East Asian and the South Asian countries efficiency changes(technological catch up) have contributed the most, while for the European countries it is the technical changes which has contributed more to labour productivity changes between 1966-2000. We also analyze the evolution of cross country distribution for the 29 countries included in our sample using Kernel densities. It seems that there are other factors like trade openness,quality of governments,population rate of growth, savings rate, corruption perception indices, rule of law index, social capital and trust variables, formal and informal rules governing the society, among others, rather than the ones that are included below for the growth accounting exercise which may be responsible for productivity accounting on point to point basis. For all the seven periods(point to point basis) we see a major role played by technological changes and efficiency changes together to account for the current period counterfactual distributions and for the bimodal distribution in year 2000, and for the period 1966-2000(not point to point basis –an excercise done similar to Kumar and Russell(2002)) we find technical changes and its combination with other tripartite and quadripartite changes jointly account for the bimodal distribution in year 2000.However, from this growth accounting exercise, we do find that there is convergence in statistical terms of efficiency changes and human capital accumulation across countries of the EU, South Asian and East Asian regions.

I: Introduction

Very much in the spirit of Quah's (1993, 1996b, 1997) suggested approach (also adopted by Galor [1996] and Jones [1997]), we analyze the evolution of the entire distribution of the four growth factors: technological change, technological catch-up, capital accumulation and human capital accumulation[2]. We analyze the contribution of these four components to the growth of countries labour productivity and to the shift in the countries distribution of labour productivity over time. Data envelopment analysis has been used to estimate the best production frontier for some of the Developed(EU Nations),Developing(South Asians) and Newly Industrialized Countries(East Asian nations) included in our study. The countries production frontier is constructed using deterministic methods requiring no specification of functional form for the technology nor any assumption about market structure or the absence of market imperfections. Technological catch up signifies movement towards the frontier, technical change is movement of the frontier, capital accumulation is movement along the frontier and human capital accumulation implying changes in the efficiency of labor.

Quah has argued compellingly that analyses based on standard regression methods focusing on first moments of the distribution cannot adequately address the convergence issue. These arguments are buttressed by the empirical analyses of Quah and others posing a robust stylized fact about the international growth pattern that

[1] Senior Lecturer,Department of Economics,Jamia Millia Islamia(JMI),New Delhi-25,India.This paper is culled out of the Phd thesis entitled "Perspective of Economic Growth in Selected South Asian and East Asian Economies" submitted at the International Trade Division of the JNU,New Delhi,India(2005)

[2] This approach to Growth Accounting is not dependent on particular assumptions about the technology,market structure,technological change and other aspects of the growth process.

begs for explanation. A plot of the distribution of output per worker across 29 countries consisting of 5 South Asian,8 East Asian and 16 EU countries(country names are given in Appendix Table I at the last) in 2000 and 1966 appears in Figure 1 and II respectively, below. (The data and the kernel based method of smoothing the distribution is described below in the section on methodology). Over this 34 year period, the distribution of labour productivity was transformed from a tri-modal distribution in 1966 into a bimodal distribution in 2000 with a higher mean(data on output per worker is available in Table III below- column II and Column III)[3]. This transformation in turn means that, while in 1966 there were countries in the lower, middle income and upper income groups, in 2000 the world had become divided, as a stylized fact, into two categories: the rich and the poor. It seems that

Figure I: Distribution of Output Per Worker , 2000(Bimodal)



Figure II: Distribution of Output Per Worker , 1966 (Trimodal)



that almost all of the East Asian economies have joined the elite 'rich group'. Quah (1996a, b, 1997) refers to this phenomenon as “two-club”, or “twin-peak”, convergence a phenomenon that renders suspect analyses based on the first moment (or even higher moments) of this distribution. Our analysis is aimed at explaining this bipolarization of the distribution of output per worker, as well as its growth pattern, in terms of the tripartite and quadripartite decomposition described below. As such, it builds upon Quah’s insights about the need to examine

[3] Two-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test(non parametric test) is used to test whether two sets of observations could reasonably have come from the same distribution. This test assumes that the samples are random samples, the two samples are mutually independent, and the data are measured on at least an ordinal scale. In addition, the test gives exact results only if the underlying distributions are continuous. data: x: output per worker in 1966 , and y: output per worker in 2000 ks = 0.5172, p-value = 0.0007 alternative hypothesis: cdf of x: output per worker in 1966 does not equal the cdf of y: out put per worker in 2000 for at least one sample point.We conclude from the test that two sample probability distributions of output per worker in 1966 and 2000 are indeed different statistically.

the "dynamics of the entire cross-section distribution" (Quah, 1997, p. 29). In this study we will further identify policies which may reduce differential levels of per-capita income levels and growth rates of regions and work out the reasons for the existence of bimodal distribution of per capita income across countries. Also, related to the concept of labour productivity is the concept of efficiency, i.e amount by which outputs can be increased without requiring extra inputs. We will also work out the 'efficiency levels' of countries included in our sample by using linear programming method of data envelopment analysis .

The main variables in use in this study will be GDP at Constant 1995 US $,capital(Constant 1995 US $) labour, life expectancy in years(proxy for human capital) and labour productivity(GDP divided by labour force) prevailing in different countries/ regions included in our study.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews literature on data envelopment analysis and on growth accounting without the need for specification of a functional form for the technology, for the assumption that technological change is neutral, or for the assumptions about market structure or the absence of market imperfections. Section III is on objectives of the study, Section IV states the hypotheses. Section V is on Methodology. Section VI describes the variables used in the study and in the efficiency analysis and gives an account of the data sources. Section VII discusses the results for efficiency levels and changes and growth accounting of the countries included in our sample .Section VIII discusses the counterfactual probability distributions and contrasts it with the labour productivity distribution of 1966. Section IX gives conclusions. References and Appendix Tables(available with author on demand) are at the end

II.Review of Literature:Data Envelopment Analysis and Growth Accounting Analysis

We have used DEA framework to work out efficiency indexes for countries included in our sample.

II.1Data envelopment analysis (DEA)

DEA is a mathematical programming approach for estimating the relative technical efficiency (TE) of production activities. The term DEA was originally proposed by Charnes et al. (1978). The Charnes et al.(1978) work extended the Farrell (1957) multiple input, single output measures of TE to the multiple-output, multiple input technology.The DEA technique permits an assessment of the performance or TE of an existing technology relative to an ideal, "best-practice", or frontier technology (Coelli et al. 1998). The frontier or best-practice technology is a reference technology or production frontier that depicts the most technically efficient combination of inputs and outputs (i.e., output is as large as possible given the technology and input levels, or input levels are as small as possible given the output levels). The frontier technology is formed as a non-parametric, piece-wise, linear combination of observed "best-practice" activities. Data points are enveloped with linear segments, and TE scores are calculated relative to the frontier technology.

II.2 Growth Accounting

The results of total factor productivity estimation differ due to different assumptions made in respect of production functions and limitations of data availability on productivity of capital and labor and quality of workers.Kumar and Russell(KR,2002) and Henderson and Russell(2003) studies are exceptions.

Kumar and Russel (2002) use frontier methods to analyze international macroeconomic convergence. In particular, they decompose the labor-productivity growth of 57 industrial, newly industralized, and developing countries into components attributable to (1) technological change (shifts in the world production frontier),(2) technological catch-up (movements toward or away from the frontier), and (3) capital accumulation (movement along the frontier). These calculations amount to standard growth accounting with a twist—without the need for specification of a functional form for the technology, for the assumption that technological change is neutral, or for assumptions about market structure or the absence of market imperfections. Indeed, market imperfections, as well as technical inefficiencies, are possible reasons for countries falling below the world-wide production frontier. Taking a cue from the Quah critique spelled out in the introduction of this study, KR(2002) go on to analyze the evolution of the entire distribution of these three growth factors.

KR study yields somewhat striking results:

(1) While there is substantial evidence of technological catch-up (movements toward the production frontier), with the degree of catch-up directly related to initial distance from the frontier, this factor apparently has not contributed to convergence, since the degree of catch-up appears not to be related to initial productivity.
(2) Technological change is decidedly non-neutral, with no improvement—indeed, possibly some implosion—at very low capital/labor ratios, modest expansion at relatively low capital/labor ratios, and rapid expansion at high capital/labor ratios.
(3) Both growth and bimodal polarization are driven primarily by capital deepening.

Henderson and Russell(2003) introduce human capital into the Kumar and Russell(KR,2002) growth accounting analysis of international macroeconomic convergence.They amend the KR methodology by (1) adopting the

Diewert(1980) approach to dynamic frontier analysis,thus precluding implosion of the worldwide production frontier over time and (a) changes in the mean and (b) mean-preserving shifts in the distribution of productivity.Their principal conclusions were

* Over half of the increase in mean productivity attributed to KR to the accumulation of physical capital was,in fact, the result of the accumulation of human capital.

* In contradiction to the KR conclusion that capital accumulation also accounts for the shift in the distribution, primarily from unimodal to bimodal, their analysis indicates that efficiency changes account for the qualitative shift from unimodal to bimodal,whereas the accumulation of physical and human capital account for the increased worldwide dispersion of productivity.

*There is evidence of technological progress in the developed nations only.

In this study we also do growth accounting with a twist-without the need for specification of a functional form for the technology,for the assumption that technological change is neutral,or for the assumptions about market structure or the absence of market imperfections.We use sample of 29 developing, newly industrialized and developed nations.The objective is to reconfirm whether indeed KR(2002) and Henderson and Russel(2003) results holds for the sample of countries included in our study.

III. Objectives of the study

- To work out technical efficiency index for each of the 29 countries in the sample and examine the impact of some of its determinants on the efficiency levels for five year interval period starting from 1966 and ending in year 2000.

- To undertake growth accounting exercise which can decompose labor productivity growth into components attributable to technological changes(shifts in the overall production frontier),technological catch up or efficiency changes(movement towards or away from the frontier),capital accumulation(movement along the frontier) and human capital accumulation.
- Identify reasons for the existence of bimodal labour productivity distribution prevailing across countries by particularly analyzing the evolution of cross country distribution over time for the 29 countries included in our sample consisting of some South Asian,East Asian and EU countries

IV.Hypothesis

1.South Asian and East Asian countries presently are more 'efficient' than the Developed nations included in the sample.
2.To test whether technological change, technological catch up ,capital accumulation and human capital accumulation are primarily responsible for differential growth in labor productivity across countries and regions and are also responsible for the existence of bimodal labour productivity distribution across countries included in our sample.

V.Methodology

The level of efficiency for each country has been worked out using Data Envelopment Analysis(DEA)[4] for five year interval period starting from 1966 and ending in year 2000.

Further, we decompose labor productivity into its components, efficiency change, technological change, capital accumulation and human capital accumulation. Technological change reflects shifts in the world production frontier, determined conceptually by the state-of-the-art, potentially transferable technology; while efficiency change reflects the movements toward (or away from) the frontier as countries adopt "best practice" technologies and reduce (or exacerbate) technical and allocative inefficiencies; and the third capital accumulation reflects movements along the frontier. The world production frontier at each point in time is constructed using deterministic, nonparametric (mathematical programming) methods (essentially, finding the smallest convex cone enveloping the data) and efficiency is measured as the (output-based) distance from the frontier. These data-driven methods do not require specification of any particular functional form for the technology, nor do they require any assumption about market structure or about the absence of market imperfections; market imperfections, as well as technical inefficiencies, are possible reasons for countries falling below the worldwide production frontier. We proxy human capital accumulation by life expectancy changes.Introduction of human capital results in a quadripartite decomposition of productivity growth.

V.1Non Parametric Construction of Technologies and Efficiency Measurement

Our approach to constructing the worldwide production frontier and associated efficiency levels of individual economies (distances from the frontier), motivated in part by the first such effort in this direction by Fare, Grosskopf, Norris, and Zhang (1994b), Charnes et. al(1978),followed by Kumar and Russell(2002) and Henderson and Russell,(2003) which in turn is based on the pioneering work of Farrell (1957) and Afriat (1972).We follow mainly Kumar and Russell(2002). The basic idea is to envelop the data in the "smallest", or "tightest fitting", convex cone, and the (upper) boundary of this set then represents the "best practice" production frontier. Our technology contains four macroeconomics variables: aggregate output and three aggregate inputs – labor, physical capital, and human capital(proxied by life expectancy in years). Let $\left(Y_t^j, L_t^j, K_t^j, H_t^j\right)$ t = 1, …, T, j =- 1, l… J, represent T observations on these four variables for each of the J countries. In particular, we construct the constant-returns-to-scale, period-t technology using (in principle) all data up to that point in time :

$$\tau_t = \left\{ \left(Y, L, K, H\right) \in R_+^4 \mid Y \le \sum_{\tau \le t} \sum_j z_\tau^j Y_\tau^j \right.$$

$$\left. L \ge \sum_{\tau \le j} \sum_j z_\tau^j L_\tau^j \;\; K \ge \sum_{\tau \le j} \sum_j z_\tau^j K_\tau^j, H \ge \sum_j z^j H, z^j \ge 0 \forall j \right\} \quad \textbf{(1)}$$

This technology is the Farrell cone; other assumptions about returns to scale would incorporate an additional constraint on the activity level, t = 1, …, T, j = 1, …. J (see, e.g., Fare, Grosskopf, and Lovell (1994)].

In this construction,each observation is interpreted as a unit operation of a linear process.z_j represents the level of operation of that process and every point in the technology set is a linear combination of observed output/input vectors or a point dominated by a linear combination of observed points.The constructed technology is a polyhedral cone,and isoquants are piecewise linear.

The Farrell (output based) efficiency index for country j at time t is defined by

$$E\left(Y_t^j, L_t^j, K_t^j, H\right) = \min\left\{\lambda \mid \left(Y_t^j \mid \lambda, L_t^j, K_t^j, H\right) \in \tau_t\right\} \quad (2)$$

This index is the inverse of the maximal proportional amount that output Y_t^j can be expanded while remaining technologically feasible, given the technology τ_t and the input quantities L_t^j, K_t^l,and H ; it is less than or equal to 1 and takes the value of 1 if and only if the jt observation is on the period t production frontier. In this case of a scalar output, the output based efficiency index is simply the ratio of actual to potential output evaluated at the actual input quantities, but in multiple-output technologies the index is a radial measure of the (proportional) distance of the actual output vector from the production frontier.

---

[4] Our efficiency calculations were carried out using the Onfront software(demo version),available from Economic Measurement and Quality I Lund AB(Box 2134,S-220 Lund,Sweden(www.emq.se).

In our simple case, we deal with only three macroeconomic variables: aggregate output and two aggregate inputs: labor and capital. Let $\left(Y_t^j, L_t^j, K_t^j\right), t = 1,.., T, j = 1,...J,$ represent T observations on these three variables for each of the J countries.

The Farrell efficiency index can be calculated by solving the following linear program for each observation:

$$\min_{\lambda, z^1,...,z^j} \lambda \text{ subject to}$$

$$Y^j / \lambda \leq \sum_k z^k Y_t^k$$

$$L^j \geq \sum_k z^k L_t^k$$

$$K^j \geq \sum_k z^k K_t^k$$

$$z^k \geq 0 \forall k.$$ [5]

The solution value of λ in this problem is the value of the efficiency index for country j at time t.

V.2 Tripartite Decomposition of the Factors Affecting Labor Productivity

We decompose the ratio of labour productivity in current year to labour productivity in base year into its three components: efficiency change(catching up to the frontier),technical change(movement of frontier) and capital accumulation(movement along the frontier).Please refer to Kumar and Russell Paper(2002) for the derivation.

$$\frac{y_c}{y_b} = \frac{e_c}{e_b}\left(\frac{\overline{y}_c(k_c)}{\overline{y}_b(k_c)} \times \frac{\overline{y}_c(k_b)}{\overline{y}_b(k_b)}\right)^{1/2}$$

$$\times \left(\frac{\overline{y}_b(k_c)}{\overline{y}_b(k_b)} \times \frac{\overline{y}_c(k_{c)}}{\overline{y}_c(k_b)}\right)^{1/2}$$

= : EFF × TECH × KACCUM.

<u>V.3Quadriparite Decomposition of the Factors Affecting Labor Productivity</u>

<u>Conceptual Decomposition</u>

Further We can decompose the ratio of labour productivity in current year to labour productivity in base year into its four components: efficiency change(catching up to the frontier),technical change(movement of the frontier), capital accumulation(movement along the frontier) and Human Capital Accumulation. Please refer to Henderson and Russell(2003) Paper for the derivation.

$$\frac{y_c}{y_b} = \frac{e_c}{e_b}\left(\frac{\hat{\overline{y}}_c(k_c)}{\hat{\overline{y}}_b(k_c)} . \frac{\hat{\overline{y}}_c(k_b)}{\hat{\overline{y}}_b(k_b)}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\hat{\overline{y}}_b(k_{c)}}{\hat{\overline{y}}_b(k_b)} . \frac{\hat{\overline{y}}_c(k_c)}{\hat{\overline{y}}_c(k_b)}\right)^{1/2} \frac{H_c}{H_b}$$

= : EFF × TECH × KACC × HACC.

V.4Kernel Densities

We employ kernel based density functions for estimating the cross country labor productivity distribution for various years.The density estimates are computed using the Rosenblatt-Parzen kernel density

[5] In DEA we maximize the weighted average of outputs divided by weighted average of inputs for each firm under the constraint that the same ratio is less than equal to one for other decision making units.The miax problem is dual of the min problem.

estimator.We use an optimal bandwidth parameter chosen as h=1.0592*σ*N^(-.20) where σ is the standard deviation of the data and N is the number of observations.Splus software has been used to estimate the Kernel smoothers.

VI.Data and Variable Description

For the technical efficiency and growth accounting exercise (labour productivity decomposition into four factors), we consider a sample of 29 countries(5 South Asian+8 East Asian+16 EU Countries) over the period 1966-2000,using data from the World Development indicators on CDROM(various years).The included countries are identified in Appendix Table I. For DEA ,Our measure of aggregate output is GDP calculated at constant 1995 US $.Aggregate inputs used in the DEA model are capital stock, labor force and life expectancy(proxy for human capital) .The capital stock for each country was calculated from gross capital formation(current US $).The measurement method is as described in(Chou,1993) . Appropriate deflator was used to estimate capital stock at constant 1995 US $.

VII. Discussion of the Results:Efficiency Levels and Changes, Technological Changes, Capital Accumulation and Human Capital Accumulation and Contribution of Such Factors to Labour Productivity Changes(1966-2000)

VII.1 Empirical Results:Technological Catch Up(Efficiency Levels and Changes)

Table I and II lists the efficiency levels of each of the 29 countries for the years 1966,1971,1976,1981,1986,1991,1996 and 2000.Efficiency indexes are calculated from the input and output data for the 29 countries included in our study.The output and input data are given below in the Appendix Tables(available with author). For comparison purposes,we calculate these indexes both with and without life expectancy (denoted by LE and WLE in the tables, respectively).Human capital is proxied by life expectancy of countries in year

Table I: Technical Efficiency Indexes(1966-2000)

	W LE	LE	WLE	LE	WLE	LE	WLE	LE
Country	1966	1966	1971	1971	1976	1976	1981	1981

Bangladesh	0.29	0.29	0.37	0.37	0.71	0.75	1	1
India	0.11	0.56	0.19	0.53	0.46	0.58	0.67	0.86
Nepal	0.53	0.53	0.56	0.56	1	1	0.97	0.97
Pakistan	0.12	0.12	0.22	0.22	0.5	0.5	0.84	0.84
Sri lanka	0.1	0.1	0.21	0.21	0.51	0.51	0.59	0.59
Belgium	0.77	0.82	0.8	0.89	0.88	0.95	0.9	0.91
Austria	0.67	0.72	0.74	0.81	0.8	0.87	0.84	0.87
Denmark	0.98	1	0.92	1	0.91	0.98	0.86	0.86
Finland.	0.59	0.62	0.6	0.65	0.65	0.71	0.71	0.75
France	0.72	0.84	0.75	0.94	0.79	0.9	0.83	0.86
Germany	0.91	1	0.75	0.96	0.79	0.9	0.83	0.83
Greece	0.33	0.36	0.4	0.43	0.45	0.49	0.59	0.59
Ireland	0.41	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.48	0.48	0.83	0.83
Italy	0.48	0.77	0.52	0.81	0.57	0.79	0.7	0.86
Luxembourg	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Netherland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Portugal	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.29	0.26	0.28	0.35	0.35
Spain	0.46	1	0.48	1	0.72	1	0.93	0.95
Sweden	0.82	0.86	0.77	0.86	0.78	0.85	0.76	0.78
UK	0.55	1	0.51	0.96	0.52	0.89	0.96	1
Norway	0.77	0.79	0.73	0.79	0.8	0.87	0.85	0.85
Malaysia	0.16	0.16	0.22	0.22	0.65	0.65	0.96	0.96
China	0.12	0.54	0.17	0.37	0.34	0.42	0.35	0.47
Indonesia	0.08	0.22	0.17	0.23	0.78	0.8	1	1
Japan	0.62	0.98	0.78	1	0.88	1	1	1
Phillipines	0.08	0.18	0.11	0.16	0.38	0.38	0.69	0.69
Singapore	0.25	0.25	0.34	0.34	0.42	0.42	0.7	0.7
Thailand	0.13	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.53	0.53	0.78	0.78
HongKong	0.3	0.3	0.31	0.31	0.75	0.75	1	1
Mean	0.46	0.58	0.50	0.60	0.67	0.73	0.81	0.83
SA (5) Mean	0.23	0.32	0.31	0.67	0.64	0.67	0.81	0.85
EU(16) Mean	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.81	0.71	0.81	0.81	0.83
EA (8)Mean	0.21	0.35	0.28	0.62	0.59	0.62	0.81	0.83

Note: Technical Efficiency is calculated using Onfront Software. Note higher values means higher technical efficiency while value one means that the country is on the best production frontier. Efficiency Indexes are calculated using inputs and output data. While the inputs are Labour force, Capital Stock(constant 1995 US$) and Life Expectancy(in years);output is GDP at constant 1995 US$; LE denotes Life Expectancy is included in efficiency measurement; WLE Denotes efficiency measurement without Life Expectancy

Table II (Continued): Technical Efficiency Indexes(1966-2000)

	W LE	LE	WLE	LE	WLE	LE	WLE	LE	Mean Efficiency WLE 1966-2000	Mean Efficiency LE 1966-2000
Country	1986	1986	1991	1991	1996	1996	2000	2000		

Bangladesh	1	1	1	1	0.96	0.96	0.91	0.91	0.78	0.78
India	0.74	0.89	0.54	0.58	0.62	0.76	0.66	0.76	0.49	0.69
Nepal	0.92	0.92	0.8	0.8	0.69	0.69	0.73	0.73	0.77	0.77
Pakistan	0.84	0.86	0.77	0.79	0.8	0.85	0.73	0.74	0.60	0.61
Sri lanka	0.68	0.68	0.63	0.63	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.51	0.51
Belgium	0.81	0.86	0.73	0.96	0.75	1	0.68	0.93	0.79	0.91
Austria	0.77	0.86	0.75	0.96	0.74	0.97	0.63	0.87	0.74	0.86
Denmark	0.81	0.87	0.73	0.92	0.79	0.99	0.71	0.91	0.83	0.94
Finland.	0.69	0.77	0.64	0.8	0.59	0.77	0.61	0.8	0.63	0.73
France	0.76	0.82	0.68	0.92	0.7	0.98	0.63	0.9	0.73	0.89
Germany	0.76	0.81	0.7	0.94	0.7	1	0.59	0.86	0.75	0.91
Greece	0.53	0.56	0.64	0.68	0.68	0.78	0.57	0.63	0.52	0.56
Ireland	0.89	0.93	0.91	0.95	1	1	1	1	0.74	0.75
Italy	0.81	0.93	0.86	1	0.71	0.93	0.61	0.83	0.65	0.86
Luxembourg	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Netherland	0.95	1	0.83	1	0.81	1	0.72	0.97	0.91	0.99
Portugal	0.4	0.43	0.58	0.6	0.61	0.7	0.51	0.56	0.39	0.43
Spain	0.9	0.98	0.97	1	0.75	0.92	0.61	0.78	0.72	0.95
Sweden	0.69	0.74	0.7	0.86	0.65	0.82	0.62	0.81	0.72	0.82
UK	0.87	0.99	0.9	1	0.8	1	0.86	1	0.74	0.98
Norway	0.82	0.87	0.67	0.77	0.65	0.89	0.67	0.89	0.74	0.84
Malaysia	0.67	0.7	0.65	0.66	0.7	0.78	0.55	0.59	0.57	0.59
China	0.47	0.59	0.4	0.46	0.58	0.73	0.61	0.77	0.38	0.54
Indonesia	0.67	0.73	0.6	0.63	0.7	0.84	0.47	0.53	0.55	0.62
Japan	0.93	1	0.89	1	0.78	1	0.68	1	0.82	0.99
Phillipines	0.5	0.53	0.53	0.54	0.72	0.79	0.61	0.64	0.45	0.48
Singapore	0.52	0.54	0.65	0.73	0.77	0.87	0.68	0.79	0.54	0.58
Thailand	0.7	0.74	0.73	0.74	0.68	0.81	0.44	0.49	0.52	0.55
HongKong	0.89	0.93	0.9	0.95	0.84	0.96	0.7	0.81	0.71	0.75
Mean	0.75	0.81	0.74	0.82	0.74	0.88	0.67	0.80	0.6651	0.7544
SA Mean	0.84	0.87	0.75	0.76	0.75	0.79	0.74	0.77		
EU Mean	0.78	0.84	0.77	0.90	0.75	0.92	0.69	0.86		
EA Mean	0.67	0.72	0.67	0.71	0.72	0.85	0.59	0.70		

Note: Technical Efficiency is calculated using Onfront Software. Note higher values means higher technical efficiency while value one means that the country is moving along the best production frontier. Efficiency Indexes are calculated using inputs and output data. While the inputs are Labour force, Capital Stock(constant 1995 US$) and Life Expectancy(in years); output is GDP at constant 1995 US;$;LE denotes Life Expectancy is included in efficiency measurement; WLE Denotes efficiency measurement without Life Expectancy

Luxembourg has an efficiency score of one in all the years with or without life expectancy(human capital).Netherlands also has an efficiency score of one in 1966,1971,1976 and 1981.Japan,UK,Belgium,Ireland,Indonesia,Spain and Germany has an efficiency score of one in at least one of the years from 1966 to 2000.In the year 2000 though mean efficiency levels(without including life expectancy as input) of South Asian countries is higher than the European Union Countries and East Asian countries. Japan has the highest average efficiency followed by Hong Kong in the East Asian region in the period 1966-2000.

Bangladesh and India too have scores of one in atleast one of the years from 1966 to 2000.It seems peculiar that these countries are on the frontier. The interpretation of this finding is that Bangladesh and India have low per capita incomes because it seems that they are relatively undercapitalized and not because they make inefficient use of the relatively meager capital inputs that it has. Another(perhaps more plausible) interpretation is that the DEA method of constructing the best -practice frontier-a lower bound on the frontier under the assumption of constant returns-fails to identify the 'true' but unknown frontier, especially at low capital labour ratios[6].

[6] We should note that these mathematical programming methods take no account of measurement error, sampling error and other stochastic phenomena. Recent research(Leopold Simar,1996;Alois Kneip

The mean efficiency scores with life expectancy included as an input, in all the years included in our study, is always found to be greater than the efficiency scores which does not take into account life expectancy as an input. This seems to suggest that some of the measured inefficiency in the simpler model, in fact, have been attributed to a relative paucity of the quantity of human capital.

Figure III and IV:Linear Fit Plot between Change in Efficiency and Efficiency Index,1966





FigureIII **Figure IV**

Ordinary least squares regression of the change in efficiency on the level of efficiency(without life expectancy) in 1966(Regressing Column VI of Table III on Regressing Column 2 in Table I) yields a coefficient of -53.760 with a t statistic of -9.74 while Ordinary least squares regression of the change in efficiency on the level of efficiency(with life expectancy) in 1966(Regressing Column VI of Table IV on Regressing Column 3 in Table II) yields a coefficient of -39.807 with a t statistic of -12.641,indicating that the less efficient countries in 1966 have, on balance,benefited from efficiency improvements than the more efficient countries.Figures III and IV confirm the negative relationship between the two.These two results seems to imply that there is a tendency for technology transfer to reduce the gap between the rich and poor countries in the sample.

VI1.2 Empirical Results for Tripartite and Quadripartite Decomposition of the Factors Affecting Labour Productivity

We have carried out the above calculations for the years 1966 ,1971 ,1976 ,1981 ,1986,1991,1996 and 2000 both with and without including life expectancy as an input besides the other inputs of capital stock and labour force. The conceptual decomposition is discussed in the section on Methodology. Appendix Tables (available with author) give the results for finding out the average efficiency changes, technological changes, capital accumulation and human capital accumulation from 1966 to 2000.The results of tripartite decomposition of labour productivity are summarized in Table III while the results of quadripartite decomposition are summarized in Table IV

Table III lists the percentage changes from 1966 to 2000 in labour productivity and each of the three components: (I) change in efficiency,(ii)technological change, and (iii) capital deepening,for all 29 countries,along with the sample mean percentage changes.The overall averages provide striking evidence that none of the three factors are primarily responsible for most of the productivity improvements over this period.The efficiency factor accounted for less than 16 %,technological change accounted for less than 15 % while the contribution of capital deepening is strikingly negative.One finds the same trend for the the South Asian and East Asian regions;the efficiency factor accounts for 29.40 % of their labour productivity growth,only 10.60% is accounted by technological changes while capital accumulation shows negative value for the South Asian region.For the East Asian region the efficiency factor accounts for 32 % of their labour productivity growth, 20.88% is accounted by technological changes while capital accumulation shows negative value.For the

---

et.al,1998;Irene Gijbels,1999;Simar and Paul W.Wilson,2000) has made substantial progress on the use of bootstrapping method to construct confidence intervals around efficiency index .In this study, however ,we are more concerned about the statistical significance of changes in the distributions of efficiency indexes and the components of tripartite and quadripartite decomposition of productivity changes.

EU region the efficiency factor accounts for mere 2.31 % of their labour productivity growth,only 11.94% is accounted by technological changes while capital accumulation shows negative value.Such results seems to convey that there are some other factors besides the ones decomposed in the growth accounting exercise which may have profound affects on labour productivity growth rates across the countries included in our sample.We have found earlier in the conditional convergence analysis(Mathur,2005) that trade openness,population rate of growth and savings rate may be key in explaining differential levels of growth per capita across nations included in our sample .It seems that there are more important factors particularly for South Asian Region, besides the ones taken here in the growth accounting exercise, which can have greater impact on labour productivity and GDP per capita growth rates. These may be policies directed towards higher infrastructure spending, making bureaucracy efficient, reducing corruption, less restrictive labor regulations, achieving political stability, implementing rule of law, understanding institutions, among others.

If we see the results of growth accounting in context of productivity changes on point to point basis(works to be average of 14.22 %) we find that efficiency changes along with technological changes and capital accumulation accounts for 24.03 % (15.17%+14.17%-5.31%).This needs explanation.Growth accounting factors accounts for more than point to point percentage change in productivity.This happens because if we take log(yc/yb)=log eff+log tech +log kacc and then we approximate log yc/yb by taylors expansion(with one term and could have had more) it works out to be (yc-yb)/yb .Similary log tech works out to be .5 ((ybarc(kc)/ybarb(kc)+ybarc(kb)/ybarb(kb))-1 and log kacc works out to be .5((ybarc(kc)/ybarc(kb)+ybarb(kc)/ybarb(kb))-1.**NOW THESE ARE APPROXIMATIONS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE EQUATIONS.IF WE WORK OUT FURTHER , (MEANYC/YB -1) WHICH WORKS OUT TO BE 14.22 %,(MEAN EFF-1) WORKS OUT TO BE 15.136 % AND (MEAN KACC-1)*100 WORKS OUT TO BE -5.32 %.PLEASE SEE THE LEFT HAND TERM AND SECOND TERM (MEAN TECH -1) *100 WORKS OUT TO BE NEARLY SAME AS THEORETICALL THEY ARE SAME AND THEY ARE CORRECTLY APPROXIMATED BY TAYLORS EXPANSION.HOWEVER THE SUM OF THREE TERMS ON RIGHT HAND SIDES DOES NOT EQUAL TO LEFT HAND SIDE BECAUSE OF APPROXIMATIONS[7].**

Table III:Percentage Change of Tripartite Decomposition Indexes(Contribution to percentage change in productivity change(point to point basis)

					Contribution to percentage change in productivity change(point to point basis)		
Country	Output	Output	Productivity	Producti	(EFF-1)	(TECH-1)	(KACC-1)*100

[7] The decomposition of (yc/yb)=eff*tech*kacc takes place between seven periods IN OUR PAPER ,i.e if current period is 1971 and base is 1966 then the above relation holds.Similarly it holds for other 6 periods.Please see the file phdjuly2005.xls(available with author) and look at columns v,w,X,Y,Z,AA,AB,AC,AD,AE,AF,AG,AH,AI AND IT IS CLEAR THAT PRODUCT OF THE THREE DECOMPOSITION FACTORS EQUALS YC/YB. Growth accounting holds for each of the seven periods. If we work out theoretically yc/yb=ec/eb*((ybarc(kc)/ybarb(kc)*ybarc(kb)/ybarb(kb)))^.5*((ybarc(kc)/ybarc(kb)*ybarb(kc)/ybarb(kb)))^.5
=eff*tech*kacc will work out to be ec/eb*yc/yb*eb/ec=yc/yb which we calculated and got it right for the seven periods.However,we have calculated these for seven periods and so we then work out the mean levels of eff ,tech and kacc.

	Per Worker, 1966	Per Worker 2000	Change (2000-1966)/1966* 100	vity Changes[8] (point to point basis)	*100	*100	
Bangladesh	468	706	50.65	6.24270	22	6	-13
India	428	1036	141.84	13.6021	38	14	-18
Nepal	285	521	82.6	9.11995	8	9	-2.
Pakistan	657	1376	109.23	11.3655	38	11	-18
Sri lanka	864	2055	137.86	13.2435	41	13	-20
Belgium	34083	74499	118.58	12.0159	-1	12	2
Austria	29628	70335	137.39	13.4291	-1	13	1
Denmark	43752	69814	59.57	7.05466	-4	7	5
Finland.	26063	63509	143.67	13.7553	1	14	0
France	32043	66330	107	11.1324	-2	11	2
Germany	40514	65671	62.09	7.21875	-6	7	7
Greece	14479	30449	110.29	12.0848	9	12	-6
Ireland	16835	66177	293.1	21.9151	16	22	-11
Italy	21508	46789	117.54	12.0191	4	12	-2
Luxembourg	44493	131722	196.05	17.0885	0	17	0
Netherland	38955	67133	72.34	8.32784	-4	8	5
Portugal	9721	25425	161.53	15.5585	14	16	-10
Spain	18238	39339	115.69	12.0087	7	12	-2
Sweden	36477	57916	58.77	6.93985	-4	7	4
UK	23580	44412	88.35	9.51808	10	10	-4
Norway	34465	72988	111.77	11.4082	-2	11	2
Malaysia	3541	11602	227.59	19.0818	33	19	-8
China	185	1375	641.68	34.3983	31	34	-18
Indonesia	647	2095	223.83	19.2180	63	19	-8
Japan	27609	83224	201.44	17.9613	2	18	0
Phillipines	2152	2731	26.91	4.01202	52	4	-17
Singapore	10194	57290	461.96	28.8233	19	29	-10
Thailand	1232	4656	277.69	22.0856	35	22	-8
HongKong	11891	46671	292.49	21.8570	21	22	-7
Grand Mean	18103	41649.86	166.53	14.22	15.17	14.17	-5.31
SA Mean	540.40	1138.8	104.44	10.71	29.40	10.60	-14.2
EU Mean	29052	62031	122.11	11.96	2.31	11.94	-.44
EA Mean	7181	26205	294.20	20.92	32	20.88	-9.5

Figure V summarizes these calculations by plotting the four growth rates(labour productivity and its three components against labour productivity in 1966.

Figure V:Percentage Changes Between 1966 and 2000 in Labour Productivity and Three Decomposition Indexes Plotted Against 1966 Labour Productivity

[8] Point to point means periods means 1966,1971,1976,1981,1986,1991,1996 and 2000.Please see Phd.xls for details(available with author)

(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)



OLS regression lines are also plotted.Figure V(a) indicates that the increases in average productivity reflects positive growth over this period for the countries included in our sample. The prominent spikes at the lower relative incomes reflect the economic emergence of the Asian "miracle" countries and is consistent with the observation about the movement of probability mass from lower and middle income group to higher income group in the cross country distribution(see section I on introduction).The negative slope coefficient of -.0282 with t value as 1.855,while not statistically significant at 5% level of significance without inclusion of critical conditioning variables, is essentially the empirical result that led many to argue that productivity growth patterns support absolute convergence[9] among South Asian, European Union and East Asian countries

[9] If the poor country's initial income per head is below the rich country's income per head ,then the poor country must grow more rapidly(higher marginal productivity and inviting capital from abroad) than the rich country, for both to ultimately achieve the common level of income per head (assuming same technology, production, population, preferences across countries). This is called absolute beta convergence (also called unconditional convergence because it implies that all countries/regions are converging to common steady state level of income).In its strongest form an implication of this hypothesis is that in the long run countries or regions should not only achieve same steady state level of income per capita

together(Mathur,2004).
Figure V(b),shows the negative relationship between the percentage change in efficiency index and the initial level of productivity .The beta coefficient has negative value of -.00103 with t value of -8.255 and R^2 of .716.The results suggest that technological catch up is partly responsible for closing some of the gap between rich and poor nations, which is atleast true for the East Asian economies since the developed nations were partly responsible for technology transfers to their region(then underdeveloped) since the 1960s.Technological transfers, however, in the South Asian region is relatively low but can play an important role in increasing their growth rates.

Figure V(C) shows that the relationship between technological changes and initial level of labour productivity is negative(-.00015) though not significant(t value -1.875).While for the East Asian region technological change is responsible for larger than average contributions to growth,it has been quite moderate for the South Asian and EU regions.
Figure V(d) shows that the relationship between capital accumulation and growth is positive and significant.(coefficient value is .000443 with t value of 9.120).The positive regression slope coefficient suggests that relatively wealthy countries have benefited more from capital accumulation than have less developed economies.

Table IV lists the percentage changes from 1966 to 2000 in labour productivity and each of the four components: (I) change in efficiency,(ii)technological change, and (iii) capital deepening and (iv)Human Capital Accumulation,for all 29 countries,along with the sample mean percentage changes.The overall averages provide striking evidence that none of the four factors are primarily responsible for most of the productivity improvements over this period.The efficiency factor accounted for less than 12 %,technological change account for less than 11 %,Human Capital accumulation accounted for less than 4% while the contribution of capital deepening is strikingly negative.One finds the same trend for the the South Asian and East Asian regions;the efficiency factor accounts for 23.20 % of their labour productivity growth,only 4.6% is accounted by technological changes,human capital accumulation accounts for 5.8% while capital accumulation shows negative value for the South Asian region.For the East Asian region the efficiency factor accounts for 23.25 % of their labour productivity growth, 15.50% is accounted by technological changes,human capital accumulation accounts for 5.38% while capital accumulation shows negative value.For the EU region the efficiency factor accounts for mere 2.56 % of their labour productivity growth,10% is accounted by technological changes,1.75 % is accounted by human capital accumulation while capital accumulation shows negative value.Such results convey that there are some other factors besides the ones decomposed in the growth accounting exercise which have important bearing on the labour productivity growth rates the countries of the EU,South Asian and East Asian region.

If we see the results of growth accounting in context of productivity changes on point to point basis(works to be average of 14.22 %) we find that efficiency changes along with technological changes , capital accumulation and human capital accounts for 21.41 % (11.83%+10.62%-4.48%+3.44%).Again growth accounting factors accounts for more than point to point percentage change in productivity.This happens because if we take log(yc/yb)=log eff+log tech +log kacc +log hacc and then we approximate log yc/yb by taylors expansion(with one term and could have had more) it works out to be (yc-yb)/yb .Similary log tech works out to be .5 ((ybarc(kc)/ybarb(kc)+ybarc(kb)/ybarb(kb))-1 , log kacc works out to be .5((ybarc(kc)/ybarc(kb)+ybarb(kc)/ybarb(kb))-1 and log HACC works out to be (Hc-Hb)/Hb**.NOW THESE ARE APPROXIMATIONS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE EQUATIONS.IF WE WORK OUT FURTHER , (MEANYC/YB -1) WHICH WORKS OUT TO BE 14.22 %,(MEAN EFF-1) WORKS OUT TO BE 11.83 %, (MEAN KACC-1)*100 WORKS OUT TO BE -4.48 %.AND (MEAN HACC-1)*100 works out to be 3.44%HOWEVER THE SUM OF FOUR TERMS ON RIGHT HAND SIDES DOES NOT EQUAL TO LEFT HAND SIDE BECAUSE OF APPROXIMATIONS[10].**

---

but also same per capita growth rates. However, these structural parameters differ across countries and regions and countries may not converge to a common level of income per -capita but to their own steady state level(long run potential level of income).Therefore, economies with lower levels of per capita income(expressed relative to their steady state levels of per capita income) tend to grow faster. Such convergence is called conditional convergence.

[10] KUMAR AND RUSSELL PAPER(AER,2002) TAKES ONLY TWO TIME PERIOD 1990 AS CURRENT AND 1965 AS BASE PERIODS ALTHOUGH THEY SAY THEY HAVE DONE IT FOR 5 YEAR TIME PERIODS MORE THAN THAT IF WE WORK OUT (eff*tech*kacc =ec/eb*yc/yb*eb/ec=yc/yb) FOR EACH COUNTRY FROM THEIR TABLE 2 PAGE 536 THE EQUALITY DOES NOT HOLD.MAYBE THEY HAVE TAKEN SOME OTHER APPROXIMATIONS OF LOGYC/YB OR LOG EFF,LOG TECH AND LOG KACC.UNLIKE OUR RESULTS, IN THEIR PAPER THEY HAVE NOT TAKEN MEANS OF DIFFERENT PERIODS BECAUSE

It is in this context that we believe that there are other factors besides efficiency changes,technological changes,capital accumulation and human capital accumulation changes which may be responsible to account for the exact point to point productivity changes.Maybe we can approximate the changes in the productivity growth by adding more terms in the Taylors expansion or including other factors which are more pertinent to account for the productivity growth.

Figure VI summarizes these calculations by plotting the four growth rates (four labour productivity components) against labour productivity of 1966.This exercise includes life expectancy(human capital) as an additional input besides capital stock and labour force. OLS regression lines are also plotted.

Figure VI(a),shows the negative relationship between the percentage change in efficiency index and the initial level of productivity. The beta coefficient has negative value of -.000711 with t value of -6.369.The results suggest (as before)that technological catch up is partly responsible for closing some of the gap between rich and poor nations(then East Asian countries).

Figure VI(b) shows that the relationship between technological changes and initial level of labour productivity which is found to be negative(-.00002) though not significant(t value -.383).
Figure VI(c) shows that the relationship between capital accumulation and growth is positive and significant.(coefficient value is .00026 with t value of 4.343).The positive regression slope coefficient suggests that relatively wealthy countries have benefited more from the capital accumulation than have less developed economies.
Figure VI(d) shows that the relationship between human capital accumulation and growth is negative and significant.(the beta slope coefficient is -.000123 and t value is -5.677).Countries which had lower labour productivity in the sixties accumulated human capital at faster rates than economies which were relatively developed in the sixties;apparently human capital accumulation has contributed to convergence of productivity

Table IV:Percentage Change of Quadripartite Decomposition Indexes (Contribution to percentage change in productivity change(point to point basis)

					Contribution to percentage change in productivity change(point to point basis)			
Country	Output	Output	Productivity	Productivity	(EFF-	(TECH-	(KACC-	(HACC-

THEY HAVE USED ONLY TWO TIME PERIODS(1990 AS CURRENT AND 1965 AS BASE PERIOD).ALSO FROM THEIR TABLE(last row) IF WE SEE THE FIGURES, 58.54 IS FOR(KACC)+6.14(TECG CHANGES) + 5.23 %(CHANGES IN EFF) DOES NOT ADD UP TO 75.06 %(YC/YB-1)*100.THE SAME HAPPENS IN HENDERSON AND RUSSELL PAPER OF 2003 WHERE HACC IS 26.5+ KACC IS 29.8 + TECH IS 7.1+ EFF IS 0.7 WHICH DOES NOT ADD UP TO 78.6 (YC/YB-1)*100.

	Per Worker, 1966	Per Worker 2000	Change (2000-1966)	Changes(point to point basis)	1) *100	1) *100	1)*100	1)*100
Bangladesh	468	706	50.65	6.24270	22.059	-0.0063	-12.518159	7.22386
India	428	1036	141.84	13.6021	7.4348	8.16580	-1.3035961	5.79850
Nepal	285	521	82.6	9.11995	7.8686	2.83933	-2.1952856	7.01254
Pakistan	657	1376	109.23	11.3655	38.214	5.74184	-18.227073	5.74433
Sri lanka	864	2055	137.86	13.2435	40.852	10.1639	-19.822606	3.08954
Belgium	34083	74499	118.58	12.0159	2.0525	10.3788	-1.5515978	1.56185
Austria	29628	70335	137.39	13.4291	3.0168	11.3355	-2.3997448	2.05808
Denmark	43752	69814	59.57	7.05466	-1.115	6.16440	1.59008550	0.90261
Finland.	26063	63509	143.67	13.7553	3.7731	11.7710	-3.5143886	1.92757
France	32043	66330	107	11.1324	1.3010	9.28567	-0.6811095	1.88272
Germany	40514	65671	62.09	7.21875	-1.71	5.56903	2.59792665	1.65536
Greece	14479	30449	110.29	12.0848	9.3750	9.97447	-6.6820037	1.98042
Ireland	16835	66177	293.1	21.9151	15.175	20.3298	-10.415059	1.78928
Italy	21508	46789	117.54	12.0191	1.3571	10.0399	-0.7854240	2.00609
Luxembourg	44493	13172	196.05	17.0885	0	15.2593	0	1.87106
Netherland	38955	67133	72.34	8.32784	-0.428	7.43309	0.44182621	0.94590
Portugal	9721	25425	161.53	15.5585	14.491	12.6199	-9.9848074	2.48779
Spain	18238	39339	115.69	12.0087	-3.288	10.0483	3.83518621	1.9285
Sweden	36477	57916	58.77	6.93985	-0.597	5.61939	1.10219475	1.42244
UK	23580	44412	88.35	9.51808	0.1539	8.14544	0.14884803	1.51054
Norway	34465	72988	111.77	11.4082	2.0386	10.3258	-1.3767775	1.17155
Malaysia	3541	11602	227.59	19.0818	34.524	14.4197	-9.3851436	4.69351
China	185	1375	641.68	34.3983	8.8014	25.2696	-1.5509048	12.1764
Indonesia	647	2095	223.83	19.2180	33.300	11.4228	-1.3211346	7.58319
Japan	27609	83224	201.44	17.9613	0.2915	14.6808	-0.2857142	2.76964
Phillipines	2152	2731	26.91	4.01202	30.567	0.17605	-10.027645	4.33349
Singapore	10194	57290	461.96	28.8233	21.215	24.9419	-12.554478	3.19823
Thailand	1232	4656	277.69	22.0856	33.870	17.4731	-7.0958519	4.79865
HongKong	11891	46671	292.49	21.8570	22.740	18.5511	-9.1420003	2.87311
Grand Mean	18103	41649	166.53	14.22	11.97	10.970	-4.589808	3.3929
SA Mean	540.40	1138.8	104.44	10.71	23.28	5.3809	-10.81334	5.7737
EU Mean	29052	62031	122.11	11.96	2.849	10.268	-1.729677	1.6938
EA Mean	7181	26205	294.20	20.92	23.16	15.866	-6.42036	5.3032

Figure VI:Percentage Changes Between 1966 and 2000 in Labour Productivity and Four Decomposition Indexes Plotted Against 1966 Labour Productivity









Table V:Percentage Change of Tripartite Decomposition Indexes(Contribution to percentage change in productivity change)

				Contribution to percentage change in productivity change

Country	Output Per Worker, 1966	Output Per Worker 2000	Productivity Change (2000-1966)/1966 *100	Efficiency change(EFF-1)*100	Technical Change(Tech-1)*100	Capital Accumulation (KACC-1)*100
Bangladesh	468	706	50.65	213.7931	50.646507	-68.1318681
India	428	1036	141.84	500	141.83903	-83.3333333
Nepal	285	521	82.6	37.73584	82.601169	-27.3972603
Pakistan	657	1376	109.23	508.3333	109.22981	-83.5616438
Sri lanka	864	2055	137.86	590	137.85929	-85.5072464
Belgium	34083	74499	118.58	-11.6883	118.58079	13.23529412
Austria	29628	70335	137.39	-5.97014	137.38839	6.349206349
Denmark	43752	69814	59.57	-27.5510	59.567662	38.02816901
Finland.	26063	63509	143.67	3.389830	143.66693	-3.27868852
France	32043	66330	107	-12.5	107.00307	14.28571429
Germany	40514	65671	62.09	-35.1648	62.093670	54.23728814
Greece	14479	30449	110.29	72.72727	110.28840	-42.1052632
Ireland	16835	66177	293.1	143.9024	293.09655	-59
Italy	21508	46789	117.54	27.08333	117.54091	-21.3114754
Luxembourg	44493	131722	196.05	0	196.05063	0
Netherland	38955	67133	72.34	-28	72.337093	38.88888889
Portugal	9721	25425	161.53	131.8181	161.53238	-56.8627451
Spain	18238	39339	115.69	32.60869	115.69085	-24.5901639
Sweden	36477	57916	58.77	-24.3902	58.773720	32.25806452
UK	23580	44412	88.35	56.36363	88.345556	-36.0465116
Norway	34465	72988	111.77	-12.9870	111.76996	14.92537313
Malaysia	3541	11602	227.59	243.75	227.58914	-70.9090909
China	185	1375	641.68	408.3333	641.67725	-80.3278689
Indonesia	647	2095	223.83	487.5	223.83498	-82.9787234
Japan	27609	83224	201.44	9.677419	201.43684	-8.82352941
Phillipines	2152	2731	26.91	662.5	26.907154	-86.8852459
Singapore	10194	57290	461.96	172	461.96405	-63.2352941
Thailand	1232	4656	277.69	238.4615	277.68756	-70.4545455
HongKong	11891	46671	292.49	133.3333	292.48633	-57.1428571
Grand Mean	18103	41649.86	166.53	155.69171	166.53399	-31.02328
SA Mean	540.40	1138.8	104.44	369.972448	104.435161	-69.5863
EU Mean	29052	62031	122.11	19.35261	122.11	-1.93668
EA Mean	7181	26205	294.20	294.4444	294.1979	-65.0946

Table V above gives an account of the **TRIPARTITE** decomposition of the labour productivity change by treating current year to be 2000 and base year as 1966.We concentrate here on the analysis of the change from the beginning to the end of our sample period 1966-2000(calculations are not done for each five year interval as above).We find that

1)Efficiency change(155.69 %) ,technical change(166.53%) and capital accumulation(-31.02 %) is able to account(155.69+166.53-31.02=291.2%) for more than the productivity change of 166.53 %.As explained earlier before because of the approximations the sum of efficiency change, technical changes and capital accumulation is not coming out to be equal to labour productivity change. **Maybe there are some other factors or better linear approximations of the decomposed factors which can account for the labour productivity changes**. It is upto future research studies to account for the latter.The surprising element in our study is that capital accumulation comes out to be negative. This may be due to the fact that KACC works out to be (eb/ec-1).Therefore, in most countries technical efficiency has increased over the sample period. ec works out to be greater than eb.If we put it in the formula KACC = (eb/ec-1),the value of KACC comes out be negative. Efficiency and technical changes are the main factors which can account for the decomposition.

2) As before if we regress efficiency changes(column V ,Table V) on initial level of labour productivity(column II,Table V) we find robust and significant negative relationship. Also,we find robust significant negative relationship between efficiency change and initial level of efficiency in 1966.Countries which had modest initial conditions in 1966 grew fast and moved towards the best practice production frontier quickly as compared to those countries which had better initial conditions.However, We do find insignificant negative relationship between technical change and initial level of productivity. As before again capital accumulation has significant positive relationship with initial level of productivity signifying that countries which had higher capital labour ratio initially were the ones who grew rapidly.

Table VI:Percentage Change of Quadripartite Decomposition Indexes (Contribution to percentage change in productivity change)

				Contribution to percentage change in productivity change			
Country	Output Per Worker, 1966	Output Per Worker 2000	Productivity Change (2000-1966)	(EFF-1) *100	(TECH-1) *100	(KACC-1)*100	(HACC-1)*100
Bangladesh	468	706	50.65	213.79	-1.9377	-68.131868	53.6233
India	428	1036	141.84	35.714	70.6979	-26.315789	41.6765
Nepal	285	521	82.6	37.735	19.4841	-27.39726	52.82457
Pakistan	657	1376	109.23	516.66	45.7447	-83.783784	43.55911
Sri lanka	864	2055	137.86	590	96.0088	-85.507246	21.35129
Belgium	34083	74499	118.58	13.414	96.8090	-11.827957	11.06235
Austria	29628	70335	137.39	20.833	108.631	-17.241379	13.78359
Denmark	43752	69814	59.57	-9	50.6658	9.89010989	5.908338
Finland.	26063	63509	143.67	29.032	115.546	-22.5	13.04617
France	32043	66330	107	7.1428	84.3788	-6.6666667	12.27052
Germany	40514	65671	62.09	-14	45.3945	16.2790698	11.48537
Greece	14479	30449	110.29	75	85.8251	-42.857143	13.16466
Ireland	16835	66177	293.1	138.09	258.907	-58	9.525809
Italy	21508	46789	117.54	7.7922	92.6994	-7.2289157	12.89129
Luxembourg	44493	13172	196.05	0	164.885	0	11.76533
Netherland	38955	67133	72.34	-3	62.4352	3.09278351	6.095843
Portugal	9721	25425	161.53	133.33	119.326	-57.142857	19.24363
Spain	18238	39339	115.69	-22	91.0959	28.2051282	12.87048
Sweden	36477	57916	58.77	-5.813	45.5319	6.17283951	9.098866
UK	23580	44412	88.35	0	72.3471	0	9.282686
Norway	34465	72988	111.77	12.658	97.7617	-11.235955	7.08338
Malaysia	3541	11602	227.59	268.75	145.219	-72.881356	33.59025
China	185	1375	641.68	42.592	283.398	-29.87013	93.44839
Indonesia	647	2095	223.83	140.90	103.470	-58.490566	59.15584
Japan	27609	83224	201.44	2.040	151.610	-2	19.80276
Phillipines	2152	2731	26.91	255.55	-2.2157	-71.875	29.78276
Singapore	10194	57290	461.96	216	359.090	-68.35443	22.40802
Thailand	1232	4656	277.69	226.6	188.950	-69.387755	30.71
HongKong	11891	46671	292.49	170	224.725	-62.962963	20.86731
Grand Mean	18103	41649	166.53	106.8	112.98	-30.96617	24.18547
SA Mean	540.40	1138.8	104.44	160.7	26.797	-41.1257	38.3367
EU Mean	29052	62031	122.11	23.96	99.514	-10.6913	11.16114
EA Mean	7181	26205	294.20	165.3	181.78	-54.4778	38.72067

Table VI above gives an account of the **quadripartite** decomposition of the labour productivity change by treating current year to be 2000 and base year as 1966.We concentrate here on the analysis of the change from the beginning to the end of our sample period 1966-2000(calculations are not done for each five year interval as above).We find that 1)Efficiency change(106.8 %) ,technical change(112.98%), capital accumulation(-30.96 %) and human capital accumulation(24.18%) is able to account(106.8+112.98-30.96+24.18%=243.96% change)-far more than the productivity change of 166.53 %.As explained earlier before because of the approximations the sum of efficiency change, technical changes,capital accumulation and human capital accumulation is not coming out to be equal to labour productivity change. **Maybe there are some other factors or better linear approximations of the decomposed factors which can account for the labour productivity changes**. It is upto future research studies to account for the latter.The surprising element in our study is that capital accumulation comes out to be negative. This may be due to the fact that KACC works out to be (eb/ec-1).Therefore, in most countries technical efficiency has increased over the sample period. ec works out to be greater than eb.If we put it in the formula KACC = (eb/ec-1),the value of KACC comes out be negative. Efficiency and technical changes are once again the main factors which can account for the decomposition of labour productivity even if we bring human capital accumulation in the model.

2) As before if we regress efficiency changes(column V ,Table VI) on initial level of labour productivity(column II,Table VI) we find robust and significant negative relationship. Also,we find robust significant negative relationship between efficiency change(column V ,Table VI) and initial level of efficiency in 1966(column III Table I).Countries which had modest initial conditions in 1966 grew fast and moved towards the best practice production frontier quickly as compared to those countries which had better initial conditions.However, We do find insignificant negative relationship between technical change and initial level of productivity. As before again capital accumulation has significant positive relationship with initial level of productivity signifying that countries which had higher capital labour ratio initially were the ones who grew rapidly. Also,we find significant negative relationship between human capital accumulation and initial level of productivity signifying convergence of human capital accumulation across the 29 countries taken in the sample.

VII.3 Analysis of Productivity Distributions:

Our objective is to assess whether the three components and then the four components of labour productivity can together change account for the deformation of the distribution of labour productivity from tri-modal distribution in 1966 to bimodal distribution in 2000 with higher mean. The distributions are reproduced again here for convenience(Figure VIIa:1966 distribution and VIIb 2000 distribution)



Figure VII(a)



Figure VII(b)

Figure VIII:Counterfactual Distribution of Labour Productivity,2000(including LE)



The distribution we employ are nonparametric kernel based density estimates, essentially Rosenblatt Parzen kernel density estimator (details are given in the section on Objectives and Methodology).

Rewrite the quadripartite decomposition of labour productivity changes as follows:

y_c= (EFF × TECH × KACC × HACC)*y_b

Thus, the labour productivity distribution in 2000 can be constructed by successively multiplying labour productivity in 1966 by each of the four factors. The counterfactual distribution of 2000 is constructed(Figure

VIII) by multiplying the average decomposition figures successively with the labour productivity in 1966.It seems from the figure that the distribution remains tri -modal and therefore the four decomposition factors of labour productivity: efficiency change, technological change, capital accumulation and human capital accumulation together have not been able to transform the 1966 distribution and bring it at par with the actual 2000 bimodal distribution of labour productivity[11].This means that some other factors like savings rate,trade openness and rate of growth of population may be are responsible for the transformation of tri modal distribution of 1966 into the bimodal distribution of 2000.It is found that by constructing counterfactual distribution of 2000 by decomposing labour productivity into three factors also do not change the results. This may be due to because we are trying to decompose labour productivity change by point to point changes in efficiency change, technical change and capital accumulation.

If we consider the current year as 2000 and base year as 1966 the counterfactual distribution of 2000 is constructed by multiplying the decomposition figures(not averages) successively with the labour productivity in 1966(eff*tech*kacc*y1966) we get some striking results different from the above analysis. All the three decomposed factors jointly(see figure IX) , efficiency change and technical change jointly(figure XII) and technical change with capital accumulation jointly(Figure XIII), can produce the counterfactual distribution of year 2000 similar to the 2000 kernel probability bimodal distribution .Efficiency change and capital accumulation jointly cannot however produce counterfactual distributions similar to 2000 kernel bimodal probability distribution.Counterfactual distribution of 2000 constructed by multiplying efficiency by labour productivity in 1966(see figure X below) although bimodal is different from the actual 2000 labour productivity distribution(result confirmed by the two sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test which shows p value of .007 and rejection of the null hypothesis that the labour productivity distributions of 2000 is different from counterfactual distribution.Counterfactual distribution of 2000 constructed by multiplying KACC by labour productivity in 1966(see figure XI below) is different from the actual 2000 labour productivity distribution(result confirmed by the two sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test which shows p value of .02 and rejection of the null hypothesis that the labour productivity distributions of 2000 is different from counterfactual distribution.However,if we construct kernel probability distribution of 2000 by multiplying efficiency change with Technical change and labour productivity of 1966 we get the distribution which is statistically and figuratively(see figure XII below) same as labour productivity distribution of 2000.Technical change with efficiency change are responsible for the bimodal labour distribution of 2000(Figure XII).Also,Technical change with capital accumulation changes are responsible for the bimodal labour distribution of 2000(see figure below XIII) **.**However,efficiency change and capital accumulation jointly are not responsible for the bimodal distribution of 2000(see figure XIVbelow).

[11] Two-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test confirms the acceptance of the null hypothesis- two sample kernel probability distributions are same; data: x: Counterfactual labour productivity distribution in 2000(V1) , and y: Labour productivity distribution in 1966(V2) ks = 0.1034, p-value = 0.9985 alternative hypothesis: cdf of x: V1 in SP66 does not equal the cdf of y: V2 in SP66 for at least one sample point. Statistical software SPLUS has been used. The data set is in appendix Table (AVAILABLE WITH AUTHOR).



FIGURE IX:COUNTERFACTUAL KERNEL PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION 2000=EFF*TECH*KACC*Y1966



Figure X:Counterfactual kernel probability distribution 2000=eff*y1966



Figure XI:Counterfactual kernel probability distribution2000=KACC*Y1966



Figure X11:Counterfactual kernel probability distribution2000=Eff*Tech*y1966



Figure X111:Counterfactual kernel probability distribution2000=Tech*kacc*y1966



Figure xiv:counterfactual kernel probability distribution of 2000=eff*kacc*y1966

If we consider the current year as 2000 and base year as 1966 the counterfactual distribution of 2000 is constructed by multiplying the quadripartite decomposition figures(not averages) successively with the labour productivity in 1966(eff*tech*kacc*hacc*y1966). All the four decomposed factors jointly,technical change alone, efficiency change and technical change jointly,technical change and capital accumulation jointly,technical change and human capital accumulation jointly ,efficiency change+technical change+capital accumulation jointly and technical change+capital accumulation+human capital accumulation jointly can produce the counterfactual distribution of year 2000 similar to the 2000 kernel probability bimodal distribution. .(all results,figues and data for this exercise is available with author on demand)

For all the seven periods(point to point basis) we see a major role played by technological changes and efficiency changes together to account for the current period counterfactual distributions and for the bimodal distribution in year 2000(results and figures available with author)

In summary,if we work out y_c= (EFF × TECH × KACC × HACC)*y_b and y_c= (EFF × TECH × KACC)*y_b

For all the seven periods(point to point basis) we see a major role played by technological changes and efficiency changes jointly to account for the current period counterfactual distributions and for the bimodal distribution in year 2000, and for the period 1966-2000(not point to point basis) we find technical changes and its combination with other changes together are responsible for the bimodal distribution in year 2000.

Conclusions

We work out efficiency levels of 29 countries included in our sample using data envelopment analysis. Luxembourg has an efficiency score of one in all the years with or without life expectancy(human capital).Netherlands also has an efficiency score of one in 1966,1971,1976 and 1981.Japan,UK,Belgium,Ireland,Indonesia,Spain and Germany has an efficiency score of one in at least one of the years from 1966 to 2000.In the year 2000 though mean efficiency levels(without including life expectancy as input) of South Asian countries is higher than the European Union Countries and East Asian countries. Japan has the highest average efficiency followed by Hong Kong in the East Asian region in the period 1966-2000.Also, initial level of labour productivity and efficiency index in 1966 had significant impact on efficiency changes from 1966 to 2000 signifying that there is evidence of technological upturn among countries which were relatively backward in 1960s.This seems to hold for sure in respect of the East Asian economies which got the boost due to technological transfers from the developed nations during the same period and also because they started opening their economies at the same time. South Asian economies on the other hand remained closed in 1960s and could not grow at faster rates subsequently.In general countries which had modest initial conditions in 1966 grew fast and moved towards the best practice production frontier quickly as compared to those countries which had better initial conditions.However, We do find insignificant negative relationship between technical change and initial level of productivity. Capital accumulation has significant positive relationship with initial level of productivity signifying that countries which had higher capital labour ratio initially were the ones who grew rapidly. There is tendency of absolute convergence among the 29 countries since 1966.

We decompose labor productivity growth into components attributable to technological changes(shifts in the overall production frontier),technological catch up(movement towards or away from the frontier),capital accumulation(movement along the frontier) and human capital accumulation(proxied by life expectancy).The overall production frontier is constructed using deterministic methods requiring no specification of functional form for the technology nor any assumption about market structure or the absence of market imperfections. Growth accounting results tend to convey that for the East Asian and the South Asian countries efficiency changes have contributed the most while for the European countries it is the technical changes which has contributed to labour productivity changes between 1966-2000. We also analyze the evolution of cross country distribution for the 29 countries included in our sample consisting of some South Asian, East Asian and EU countries using Kernel densities. It seems that there are factors like savings rate , trade openness, quality of institutions ,geography, among others rather than the ones that are included above for the growth accounting exercise which may be responsible for productivity accounting on point to point basis.This particular research problem may be taken up by researchers in future. For all the seven periods(point to point basis) we see a major role played by technological changes and efficiency changes together to account for the current period counterfactual distributions and for the bimodal distribution in year 2000, and for the period 1966-2000(not point to point basis) we find technical changes and its combination with other changes together accounting for the bimodal distribution in year 2000.

Our results contradicts the Kumar and Russel(2002) and Henderson and Russell(2003) results which found that different rate of capital accumulation and human capital across nations are primarily responsible for the existence of differential levels of per capita income levels and growth rates across nations respectively and further such factors were also responsible for the evolution of bimodal distribution of labour productivity today across nations. In a way their results(KR) confirmed the use of simple and extended Solow model(Solow,1956,Jones,2002) along with their factor accumulation assumptions in analyzing the convergence process of per capita incomes across nations.Our growth accounting exercise and regression exercise suggest that there is some evidence of absolute convergence(supports the use of Solovian model(1956) in this context) and convergence in statistical terms of efficiency changes and human capital accumulation across countries of the EU, South Asian and East Asian regions.

Generally, speaking policies that will increase labour productivity and particularly in the services sector, open up trade with all countries, increase share of savings in GDP, reduce adverse administrative regulations, increase infrastructure spending, policies that support private capital flows along with technology and human capital skills transfers from rich to poor nations can increase efficiency levels of countries, help more in reducing per capita income differences and growth rates across countries and regions, and also help in achieving the basic goal of planning- i.e., improve the living standards of the people .

References

Afriat, Sydney(1972). “Efficiency Estimation of Production Functions.” International Economic Review, October 1972, 13 (3), pp. 568-98.

Banker, R.D(1990),". Stochastic data envelopment analysis", Working Paper..Department of Economics and Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics,Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR. 97331 USA

Charnes, Abraham;Cooper, William W. and Rhodes, E(1978). “Measuring the Efficiency Of Decision-Making Units.” European Journal of Operational Research, 1978, 3.pp 429-444

Charnes, Abraham; Cooper, William W.; Lewin, Arie Y. and Seiford, Lawrence M.(1994) Data envelopment analysis: Theory, methodology, and application, Boston, MA: Kluwer,.

Chou,Ji(1993),"Old and New Development Models:The Taiwanese Experience",Paper presented at the NBER-East Asia seminar in Economics Fourth Annual Conference.

Coelli, T., D.P. Rao, and G. Batteese(1998). An introduction to efficiency and productivity analysis. London, Kluwer Academic Publishers. 1998.

Diewert,E(1980),"Capital and the Theory of Productivity Measurement,"American Economic Review 70:260-267

Farrell, Michael J(1957). “The Measurement of Productive Efficiency”, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A, General, 1957, 120(3), pp. 253-82.

Fare, Rolf; Grosskopf, Shawna; Norris, M. and Zhang, Z(1994b). “Productivity Growth, Technical Progress and Efficiency Change in Industrialized Countries”. American Economic Review, March , 84 (1),pp. 66-83.

Galor, Oded(1996), “Convergence? Inferences from Theoretical Models”, Economic Journal, July, 106(437), pp. 1056-69.

Gijbels, Irene; Mammen, Enno; Park Byeong U. and Simar, Leopold.(1999) “On

Estimation ofMonotone and Concave Frontier Functions.” Journal of the American Statistical Association, March 1999, 94(445), pp. 220-28.

Henderson,D.J and R.Robert Russell(2003)," Human Capital and Convergence: A Production-Frontier Approach" ,Revised August 2003,University of California,Riverside Working Paper No. 29

Jones, C. I.,(1997) "On the Evolution of the World Income Distribution", Journal of EconomicPerspectives, Summer

Jones,Charles.,I(2002),Introduction to Economic Growth,Second Edition,WW Norton and Company,Incorporation,US.

Kneip, Alois; Park. Byeong U. and Simar, Leopold(1998). “A Note on the Convergence of Non-parametric DEA Estimates for Production Efficiency Scores.” Econometric Theory, December 1998, 14(6), pp. 783-93.

Kumar, Subodh and Robert Russell,(2002),"Technological Change, Technological Catch-up and Capital Deepening: Relative Contributions to Growth and Convergence ,American Economic Review,Volume 92,No.3

Mathur, Somesh .K(2004),"Absolute Convergence: Its Speed for Selected Countries for 1961-2001",Journal of Indian School of Political Economy, Volume XVI, January-March Issue.

Mathur,Somesh K(2005),"Perpective of Economic Growth in Selected South Asian and East Asian Countries", PhD submitted to the International Trade Division,JNU,Delhi,India

Quah(1993),"Galton's Fallacy and Tests of Convergence Hypothesis,"Scandinavian Journal of Economics,95,4,427-443

_____,(1996a) “Convergence Empires across Economies with (Some) Capital Mobility.” Journal of Economic Growth, March 1996a. 1(1), pp. 95-124.

Quah, D.(1996b) "Twin Peaks: Growth and Convergence in Models of Distribution Dynamics",Economic Journal, July

Quah, D. (1997). Empirics for Growth and Distribution: Stratification, Polarization,and Convergence Clubs, Journal of Economic Growth 2, 27-59.

Rosenblatt,M(1956) Remarks on some nonparametric estimates of a density function.Annals of Mathematical Statistics,27,642-69

Simar,Leopold(1996),"Aspects of Statistical Analysis in DEA-Type Frontier Models",Journal of Productivity Analysis,July,7(2-3),pp 177-85.

Simar,Leopold and Wilson,Paul W,(2000),"A General Methodology for Bootstrapping in Non Parametric Frontier Models",Journal of Applied Statistics,August,27(6),pp 779-802

Solow,Robert M(1956),"A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth,"Quarterly Journal of Economics 70(February):65-94

Appendix Table I:Countries and Regions Included in the Study

Countries(44)/Regions(4)

South Asia(5)

Bangladesh

India

Nepal

Pakistan
Sri-Lanka
European Union(16includingUK)
Belgium
Austria
Denmark
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Ireland
Italy
Luxembourg
Netherlands
Portugal
Spain
Sweden
United Kingdom
Norway
EAST ASIA(8)
Malaysia
China
Indonesia
Japan
Phillipines
Singapore
Thailand
Hong Kong