

:

(1998-1978)

*

.(1998-1978)

(Malthusian Era)

:

(Causality)

:

:

2003/3/30

.2004/4/7

*

1998 1978

(Thomas Malthus)

1798

.1998

1978

.(Becker et al., 1999), (Galor and Weil, 1999)

(Barro and Martin, 1999: 14-58)

.(Becker et al., 1999)

.(Becker et al., 1990: 3)

"(Endogeneous Economic Growth Theory)

.1

.2

.3

.4

(Barro, 1999:1-47), (Grossman and Helpman, 1994),

.(Lucas, 1988), (Romer, 1994), (Petrucci, 2003)

.(Becker et al., 1990:14)

.(Becker et al., 1999)

(Ciccone and Hall, 1996),

(Becker et al., 1999), (Bloom

.et al., 1999: 1-13)

.(Kemer, 1993)

.(Pritchett, 1996: 26)

(Positive

Externalities)

"(Endogeneous Population Growth Models)

(Barro and Becker, 1989), (Bloom, et al., 1999: 5-

.7, 29), (Galor, et. al. 1999)

-

:

(Becker et al., 1999), (Galor et al.

:

.1999), (Bloom et al., 1999: 2-3)

(Becker et al.,1999)

.(Beaudry and Greene, 2001)

.(Precautionary Childbearing)

(Youth-

.Dependency Ratio)

.(Kremer, 1993)

$$(2) \quad Y = B(h.L)^{1-\alpha} N x^\alpha = B(h.N)^{1-\alpha} L^{1-\alpha} K^\alpha$$

$$N.x = (\quad) = K \quad (1990-1965)$$

(Bloom et al., 1999)

(N)

(h)

(learning by doing or innovating

by investing)

$$(3) \quad N = f \left(\int_{t=0}^T I(t) dt \right)$$

(Cobb-Douglas)
:(Romer, 1990)

$$(1) \quad Y = B(h.L)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^N (x_j)^\alpha$$

(f)

:(3)

$$(4) \quad N = f(K_T) = \phi(K_T)^r$$

$(\phi, r > 0)$

N j :x_j

: r φ

(t)

(Romer, 1990)

(Symmetric)

$$(5) \quad h = \theta \left(\frac{S_L}{P} \right)^q$$

$(\theta, q > 0)$

$$(8) \quad G(y) = G\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right) + G(L) - G(P)$$

: S_L

.(Skilled Labor)

: P

: θ, q

(Barro and

Martin, 1999: 265-284)

: ()

(5) (4)

$$(9) \quad G\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right) = \lambda \left[\text{Ln}\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right)^* - \text{Ln}\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right) \right] + \xi$$

$$(6) \quad \text{Ln}\left(\frac{Y}{P}\right) = \text{Ln}B + (1-\alpha)\text{Ln}(\theta \cdot \phi) + q(1-\alpha)\text{Ln}S_L + [-q(1-\alpha)-1]\text{Ln}P + [\alpha + r(1-\alpha)]\text{Ln}K + (1-\alpha)\text{Ln}L$$

() : $\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right)^*$

.(Steady - State Equilibrium)

() : Ln

() : $\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right)$

:(MI)

: λ

.(the rate of convergence to the steady state)

$$(MI) \quad \text{Ln}y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Ln}S_L + \beta_2 \text{Ln}P + \beta_3 \text{Ln}K + \beta_4 \text{Ln}L + \varepsilon$$

: ξ

:

: y

.(6)

: β_0

$$(10) \quad \text{Ln}\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right)^* = \beta \mathbf{X}$$

.(6)

: $\beta_1 \dots \beta_4$

: ε

\mathbf{X}

β

:

(9)

(7)

.(Bloom et al.,1999)

(8)

$$(11) \quad G(y) = \lambda \beta \mathbf{X} - \lambda \text{Ln}(y) + \lambda \text{Ln}\left(\frac{L}{P}\right) + G(L) - G(P) + \xi$$

$$(7) \quad y = \frac{Y}{P} = \frac{Y}{L} \cdot \frac{L}{P}$$

(M2) $G(y) = \eta_0 + \eta_1 G(I_K) + \eta_2 G(S_L) + \eta_3 Ln(y) + \eta_4 Ln(LP) + \eta_5 Ln G(L) + \eta_6 G(P) + \zeta$

δ_0
 $\delta_3, \delta_2, \delta_1$
 ε ($v = \gamma \cdot \varepsilon$)
 P^*
 v

(M3)

I_K
 LP
 η_0
 η_1, \dots, η_6

(M4) $G(P_t) = \mu_0 + \mu_1 G(y_t) + \mu_2 G(LF_t) + \mu_3 G(P_{t-1}) + v$

X

(Partial-Adjustment Model)

λ_0
 v

(12) $\frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}} = \left(\frac{P_t^*}{P_{t-1}} \right)^\gamma$

y ($t-1$)
 P
 L
 S_L
 P_t^*
 $t-1$
 I_K (Adjustment Factor)
 γ

(K)

LF
 $G(LF)$
 $G(LF)$
 $G(LF)$
 $G(LF)$

(M3) $Ln P_t = \delta_0 + \delta_1 Ln y_t + \delta_2 Ln LF_t + \delta_3 Ln P_{t-1} + v$

(Ljung-Box) χ^2 (1) (SL)

(%5) [AR(1)] (1998-1978)

(Greene, 2003: 274-275) (

(1) (M1)

(.085) (.079) (ρ) (.078) ()

(%1)

(Gujarati, (Multicollinearity)

(%10) .1995: 335-339)

(1)

() ()

(M2) t (%0.35)

(2) (%1)

(F-Statistic) F

(%1)

\bar{R}^2 R^2

(D.W. Statistic) -

(%10) (Positive Autocorrelation)

(%10) (D.W.) (1)

(%5)

(Feedback

Effect)

() .() - -

(D.W.)

(h-statistic)

(Greene, 2003), (Gujarati, 1995:

.605-607)

()

(h-statistic)

(non-convergence (divergence)

(-1.96 1.96)

.case)

(instrumental variable)

(M4)

F

(3)

(D.W.)

(%1)

(2)

χ^2

(Ljung- Box)

(%5)

(M3)

()

(3)

(Gujarati, 1995: 725), (disequilibrium)

(1.73) (h-statistic)

(%5)

.F \bar{R}^2

(Fitted values)

.(4)

(Fitted LnP)

(Fitted G(P))

:	:	-	-
.	.	-	-
.	.	-	-
.	.	-	-
.	.	-	-
.	.	-	-

(1)
(M1)

Dependent variable: Ln y									
Method:	Explanatory variables				Degrees of freedom (d.f.)	F	R ²	\bar{R}^2	D.W.
	OLS	Constant term	LnS _L	LnP					
Parameters	7.40	0.28	-0.35	0.27	3.17	18.93**	0.77	0.73	1.11
t-statistic	4.82 **	4.78 **	-4.30**	2.97**					
Autocorrelations									
1) D.W.									
Number of observations (N)	Number of Regressors (k)	Level of sig. = 0.05		Case	Decision				
		d _L	d _U						
21	3	1.026	1.669	d _L <dw<d _U 1.026<1.11<1.669	indecision				
2) Autocorrelation coefficients ($\hat{\rho}_j$) Dependent variable: \hat{e}_t (residuals); independent variables: \hat{e}_{t-j}									

Lag (j)	$\hat{\rho}_j$	Ljung-Box (LB) statistic	Critical χ^2 at level of sig. = 0.05	Decision (H ₀ : absence of autocorrelation)
1	0.40	3.90	3.84	Reject H ₀
2	0.11	4.210	5.99	Do not reject H ₀
3	-0.01	4.213	7.82	Do not reject H ₀
4	-0.14	4.79	9.49	Do not reject H ₀
5	-0.30	7.42	11.07	Do not reject H ₀

Re-estimation

Dependent Variable: Ln y

Method		Explanatory variables				$\hat{\rho}$	F	\bar{R}^2
		Constant term	LnS_L	LnP	LnI_K			
Prais-Winsten	Parameters	7.94	0.097	-0.24	0.24	0.85	4.14*	0.30
	t-statistic	2.56*	1.94 [⊗]	-1.19	2.61*	6.54**		
Cochrane-Orcut	Parameters	12.46	0.08	-0.52	0.23	0.79	4.90*	0.36
	t-statistic	2.81**	1.54	-1.89 [⊗]	2.47*	5.07**		
Maximum Likelihood	parameters	8.08	0.099	-0.25	0.24	0.83		0.31 [§]
	t-statistic	2.78**	1.97 [⊗]	-1.33	2.59*	5.95**		

⊗ Sig. at 0.10

* Sig. at 0.05

**Sig. at 0.01

$$\bar{R}^2 = 1 - \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{S^2} = 1 - \frac{0.019}{0.028} \approx 0.31 \quad \text{: (Gujarati, 1995: 208)} \quad \text{: §}$$

(2)

(M2)

Dependent variable: G(y)

Method: OLS	Explanatory variables							d.f.	F	R ²	\bar{R}^2	D.W.
	Constant term	$G(I_K)$	$G(S_L)$	Lag (Ln y)	$Ln(LP)$	$G(L)$	$G(P)$					
parameters	-6.34	0.29	-0.19	0.61	-0.78	0.53	-4.84	6.13	17.32**	0.89	0.84	2.52
t-statistic	-5.62**	4.95**	-1.98 [⊗]	5.24**	-6.61**	2.11 [⊗]	-4.45**					

Autocorrelations

1) D.W.

Number of observations (N)	Number of Regressors (k)	Level of sig. = 0.05		Case	Decision
		d _L	d _U		
20	6	0.692	2.162	4 - d _U < dw < 4 - d _L 1.84 < 2.52 < 3.31	indecision

2) Autocorrelation coefficients ($\hat{\rho}_j$)

Dependent variable: \hat{e}_t (residuals); independent variables: \hat{e}_{t-j}

Lag (<i>j</i>)	$\hat{\rho}_j$	Ljung-Box (LB) statistic	Critical χ^2 at level of sig. = 0.05	Decision (H ₀ : absence of autocorrelation)
1	-0.33	2.47	3.84	Do not reject H ₀
2	-0.28	4.43	5.99	Do not reject H ₀
3	0.02	4.45	7.83	Do not reject H ₀
4	0.36	7.91	9.49	Do not reject H ₀
5	-0.25	9.67	11.07	Do not reject H ₀

©Sig. at 0.10

* Sig. at 0.05

**Sig. at 0.01

(3)
(M4) (M3)

(M3)											
Dependent variable: LnP_t											
Method: OLS	Explanatory variables				d.f.	F	R ²	\bar{R}^2	D.W.	N	h-statistic
	Constant term	$Ln y_t$	$LnLF_t$	LnP_{t-1}							
parameters	1.06	-0.07	-0.003	0.91	3.16	2953.20**	0.998	0.998	1.88	20	0.276
t-statistic	3.14**	-2.66*	-0.28	63.61**							
(M4)											
Dependent variable: $G(P_t)$											
Method: OLS	Explanatory variables				d.f.	F	R ²	\bar{R}^2	D.W.	N	h-statistic
	Constant term	$G(y_t)$	$G(LF_t)$	$G(P_{t-1})$							
parameters	0.03	-0.02	-0.05	0.36	3.15	31.15**	0.86	0.83	1.21	19	1.731
t-statistic	6.55**	-0.91	-7.91**	3.70**							

* Sig. at 0.05

**Sig. at 0.01

(4)

Dependent variable		Constant term	Explanatory variable	d.f.	F	\bar{R}^2
Ln y			<i>Fitted LnP</i>			
	parameters	13.86	-0.46	1.18	16.21**	0.45
	t-statistic	8.16**	-4.03**			
G(y)			<i>Fitted G(P)</i>			
	parameters	0.11	-2.75	1.17	4.82*	0.18
	t-statistic	2.02 [⊗]	-2.20*			

⊗ Sig. at 0.10

* Sig. at 0.05

**Sig. at 0.01

:

the Density of Economic Activity, *American Economic Review*, 86 (1): 54-70.

Galor, Oded, and Weil, David. 1999. From Malthusian Stagnation to Modern Growth, *American Economic Review*, 89 (2): 150-154.

Greene, William H. 2003. *Econometric Analysis*, Fifth Edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Grossman, Gene, and Helpman, Elhanan. 1994. Endogenous Innovations in the Theory of Growth, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8 (1): 23-44.

Gujarati, Damodar. 1995. *Basic Econometrics*, Third Edition, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Kremer, Michael. 1993. Population Growth and Technological Change: One Million B.C. to 1990, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108 (3): 681-716.

Lucas, Robert. 1988. On the Mechanics of Economic Development, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22: 3-42.

Petrucci, Alberto. 2003. Money, Endogenous Fertility and Economic Growth, 25 (4): 527-540.

Pritchett, Lant. 1996. Population Growth, Factor Accumulation, and Productivity, *The World Bank*, Policy Research Working Paper 1567.

Romer, Paul. 1994. The Origins of Endogenous Growth, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8: 3-22.

Barro, Robert, and Becker, G. 1989. Fertility Choice in a Model of Economic Growth, *Econometrica*, 57 (2): 481-501.

Barro, Robert, and Sala-i-Martin, Xavier. 1999. *Economic Growth*, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Barro, Robert. 1999. *Determinants of Economic Growth, A Cross-Country Empirical Study*, The MIT Press, Cambridge.

Beaudry, Paul, and Green, David. 2001. Population Growth, Technological Adoption and Economic Outcomes: A Theory of Cross Country Differences for the Information Era, *NBER*, Working Paper Series (8149).

Becker, Gary, Glasser, Edward, and Murphy, Kevin. 1999. Population and Economic Growth, *American Economic Review*, 89 (2): 145-149.

Becker, Gary, Murphy, Kevin, and Tamura, Robert. 1990. Human Capital, Fertility, and Economic Growth, *NBER*, Working Paper Series (3414).

Bloom, David, Canning, David, and Malaney, Pia. 1999. Demographic Change and Economic Growth in Asia, *Center for International Development at Harvard University*, Working Paper (15).

Ciccone, Antonio, and Hall, Robert. 1996. Productivity and

...

**Population Growth and Economic Growth with the Presence
of Technological Progress
An Empirical Study on Jordan Over the Period (1978-1998)**

*Adnan Fadel Abo Al-Haija**

ABSTRACT

This paper aims at examining the relationship between economic and population growth paths within a bi-directional causality context, in which technological progress plays the key role.

The empirical part of the study utilizes Jordanian data for the period (1978-1998).

The study assumes that improving individuals' standards of living as well as creating more job opportunities for women will effectively reduce population growth rates, which in turn contributes to raise levels and growth rates of per capita income.

Benefiting from recent contributions of the economic theory, this study developed four econometric models to test the hypotheses.

It has been found that raising levels of human and physical capital tends to generate higher levels of per capita income, while higher population growth rates dampen income growth rates.

Also, it has been found that higher female participation rates in the labor market accelerate per capita growth rates.

This study concludes that a positive steady-state growth rate in per capita income cannot be reached unless higher investment rates are attained in physical and human capital as well as in technical knowledge in excess of population growth rates.

Based on the above- stated findings and conclusion, it is recommended to exert more efforts toward broadening technical knowledge, enhancing investment in human and physical capital, and increasing more education and job opportunities for women.

* Department of Finance and Banking/ Department of Economics, Al-alBait University, Al-Mafraq, Jordan. Received on 30/3/2003 and Accepted for Publication on 7/4/2004.