

:

(2000-1968)

*

(0.24-) (0.007) (0.17) (0.47)

:

.(1985)

(1984)

.(1995)

.(Johnson, 1965)

*

2003/7/29

.2004/4/13

: (K) (L)
 $Q = Q(L, K) \dots(1)$

:
 $Q = \alpha_0 L^{\alpha_1} K^{\alpha_2} \dots(2)$

:
 $\log Q = \log \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log L + \alpha_2 \log K \dots(3)$

(3)
 : :
 $\frac{1}{Q} \cdot dQ = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot \frac{1}{L} \cdot dL + \alpha_2 \cdot \frac{1}{K} \cdot dK \dots(4)$
-1
-2

: (4)
 $GQ = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 GL + \alpha_2 GK \dots(5)$
 : :
 :GQ -1
 :GL
 :GK
 $\alpha_2 \alpha_1 \alpha_0$.(Todaro, 1989)
-2

(IX) (POP) (1988)
 : (Esfahani, 1991)
 (IM) -3
 : (Esfahani, 1991))
 : ()
 $Q = Q(L, K, IX, IM, POP) \dots(6)$
-4

(Q)
(Cobb-Douglas)

: (Multicollinearity)

(6)

(GQ)

(GK)

(GL)

:

(GIM)

(Hammad, 1986)

(GPOP)

(GIX)

:

)

(1993

$$GQ = GQ (GL, GK, GIM, GIX, GPOP)$$

... (7)

(GIM)

:

(GPW)

(GE)

-1

:

(Branson, 1979) (GY)

$$GIM = GIM (GE, GPW, GY)$$

... (8)

-2

(GIX)

(GE)

(GPW)

:

(Branson, 1979)

$$GIX = GIX (GE, GPW)$$

... (9)

:

) (1993-1983)

(Chenery-

-

(1996

(Chenery, 1975)

Syrquin)

(%62.2)

)

(%21.4)

(

(%59.3)

.(1993

)

(1990)

(1987-1970)

(1990)

-1972)

(1986

%10.7

)

(1995

:

(1993-1968)

(1995)

%5

%1

.()

)

(1995

(1987-1968)

-1974) (1974-1968)

(1979

.(1987-1983) (1983-1979)

()

.%4.2

. %5

-. %23.9 (1975-1973)
(1985-1981)

(1) %1.5

(1997-1993)
(1975-1973) %9.1

.%1.0-

%17.1 (1985-1981)
. %13.3- (1975-1973) (2000-1968)

(2003-1999)

-

%2.8

%3.5

(1996) %5.6 1084 1968 17.7
(2001) .2000

%20.9 %12.8

25.7

2000 162.3 1968

%15.5 %10.2

715.1 1968 2.14

2000

%66.2 %17.6
(1996)

%13.7 (2000-1968)

:

%87.01 .%1.5

%11.14 1968 %5.9

.%1.3

1976 %19.9

%13.47 %77.83

(2001 1979 1968
: %13.02 %75.03 1988
%39.8 1970 %93.7 1994) 1982
1998 2000 .(1996
%4.1 %0.8 %73.5
.(1998 1970)
:(2002) %15.8
: 1968
%58.9
: %64.0
%84.6
%82.6)
%82.2 .(1970
1979 %72.8 %47.8 %52.7
%68.8 1988 1979
%68.5 %70.4 %65.8 %57.2 2000
%71.4 %64.6 %70.1 1998 : %47.1
1979) %65.3
.(1998 1988)
.(2001 1979
1988 1979 %47.1
%53.9 1979 %47.6 1968
%13.9 %0.6 .2000
%15.7 %0.7
%0.6 :
%9.6
%2.8 %2.3 (2000-1968) %11.3
1968 %10.2
.(1988 1979) 1979 %9.64
: %11.16
1987
44 1974 25 %11.4 %12.2
.1998 27 1984) %15.5 2000 1992
.(2000 1992) (1989
%6.2 %3.3
%4.0 1968 %56.8
) 2000 %55.4 1979 %54.2

%69.2 %40.4 %47.0
(1998 1984 1974)

(12) (11) (10)
(Two-Stage

.Least Squares)

(Consistent) ()
(Over-Identified)

(Auto- (Autocorrelation)
Dickey-Fuller .Regressive Model)

Stationary
(5) (4) (3)

R² :
(F-ratio) (Adjusted R²) (9) (8) (7)

(Single Equation)

$$GQ = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 GL + \alpha_2 GK + \alpha_3 GIM + \alpha_4 GIX + \alpha_5 GPOP + U_1 \quad \dots(10)$$

$$GIM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 GE + \beta_2 GPW + \beta_3 GY + U_2 \quad \dots(11)$$

$$GIX = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 GE + \gamma_2 GPW + U_3 \quad \dots(12)$$

(10)
(11)

$U_3 \quad U_2 \quad U_1$

$\gamma_1 \quad \gamma_0 \quad \beta_3 \quad \beta_2 \quad \beta_1 \quad \beta_0 \quad \alpha_5 \quad \alpha_4 \quad \alpha_3 \quad \alpha_2 \quad \alpha_1 \quad \alpha_0 :$

γ_2

(Endogeneous Variables)

(12)

:(Exogeneous Variables)

(Rank

(Identification Problem)

Condition for Identifibility)

(Over-Identified)

(Two-

Stage Least Squares)

)

(

$$= 0.21 (0.81) + 0.003 (0.52)$$

$$= 0.17$$

%1
%0.47

%26.5

0.17

:(GY)

-

$$\frac{dGQ}{dGY} = \frac{\partial GQ}{\partial GIM} \frac{dGIM}{dGY}$$

$$= 0.21 (0.033)$$

$$= 0.007$$

:

:(GE)

-

0.007

:

:

$$\frac{dGQ}{dGE} = \frac{\partial GQ}{\partial GIM} \frac{dGIM}{dGE} + \frac{\partial GQ}{\partial GIX} \frac{dGIX}{dGE}$$

$$= 0.21 (-1.13) + 0.003 (-1.42)$$

$$= - 0.24$$

(14) (13)

(Chenery-Syrquin)

-

:

$$DR = \delta_0 + \delta_1 YP + \delta_2 POP + \delta_3 NX + U_4 \quad \dots(13)$$

$$LDR = \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon_1 YP + \varepsilon_2 POP + \varepsilon_3 NX + U_5 \quad \dots(14)$$

:DR :

0.24

:(GPW)

-

(-)

:LDR

:NX

:YP

:POP

:U₆

:ε₃ ε₂ ε₁ ε₀ δ₃ δ₂ δ₁ δ₀

ε₂ ε₁ δ₂ δ₁

$$\frac{dGQ}{dGPW} = \frac{\partial GQ}{\partial GIM} \frac{dGIM}{dGPW} + \frac{\partial GQ}{\partial GIX} \frac{dGIX}{dGPW}$$

			(Ordinary		(14) (13)
		-	Dickey-Fuller		Least Squares)
		-			
					(6)
					(Autocorrelation)
					(Auto-Regressive Model)
				(14) (13)	(R ²)
		:			
	:	:			
	:				
		-1			
	%70.1		(LDR)		
			0.038		(YP)
%65.3	%64.6				
.1998	%71.4		0 18		
				%1	
		-2	%0.038		
	(%57.2) 2000				%0.18
	%47.1				
	:				
			%1		
		-3			
					%0.034
	(%55.4) 2000				%0.0460
	:				
		-4			

-2

(0.003)
 .(0 47)

-5

-3

:

:

-1

(1)

(%)	(%)	(%)	
13.3-	1.0-	23.9	1975-1973
13.7	0.3	2.1	1980-1976
17.1	3.7	1.5-	1985-1981
8.0	0.6-	9.1	1990-1986
3.2	9.1	2.5	1997-1993

.36 1996 (1995-1964) :

.64 2001 2 37

.64 2002 6 38

(2)

<i>(Exogeneous Variables)</i>		<i>(Endogeneous Variables)</i>	
(GL)	-	(GQ)	-
	-		-
	(GK)		(GIM)
(YP)	-	(GIX)	-
(GE)	-		
(GPW)	-		
(GY)	-		

(3)

(10) - (GQ) :			
<i>P-values</i>	<i>T-values</i>	<i>Estimated Coefficients</i>	<i>Independent Variables</i>
0.0007	3.89	4.9	(Constant Term)
0.0234	2.42	0.33	(GL)
	10.25	1.06	(GK)
	5.1	0.21	(GIM)
0.936	0.1	0.003	(GIX)
	5.95	0.47	(GYP)

R² = 0.928

Adj. R² = 0.911

DW = 2.22

F = 52.29

(4)

(11) - (GIM) :			
<i>P-values</i>	<i>T-values</i>	<i>Estimated Coefficients</i>	<i>Independent Variables</i>
0.0527	2.07	8.38	(Constant Term)
0.8672	0.17	0.033	(GY)
0.0229	2.47	0.13-	(GE)
0.0249	2.44	0.81	(GPW)

R² = 0.375

Adj. R² = 0.244

DW = 2.14

F = 2.86

(5)

(12) - (GIX) :			
P-values	T-values	<i>Estimated Coefficients</i>	<i>Independent Variables</i>
0.0018	3.4	17.95	(Constant Term)
0.0394	2.16-	1.42-	(GE)
0.0773	1.84	0.52	(GPW)

R² = 0.214
DW = 1.99

Adj. R² = 0.127
F = 2.45

(6)

(14 13)

D.W.	() F-Ratio	R ²	NX	POP	YP	Constant Term	Dependent Variable
1.75	362.51	0.98	0.068- (2.11-) 0.0443	0.34 (16.31)	0.18 (1.91) 0.0670	691.9- (8.98-)	DR T-Values P-Values
0.78	151.01	0.96	0.012 (2.92) 0.0073	0.046 (4.89)	0.038 (3.12) 0.0045	96.3- (2.16-) 0.0404	LDR T-Values P-Values

1970
1968
1984 1974 1970 5
1989
1998
2002 -1964) 1989
52 2001 .(1989
1990
1994
1996
2002
.6 38
1993 1985
.96-79 1995
: 1993-1968 -39 1 11
1984 1984 1979
1988

- Development, 1950-1970*, Oxford University Press, London. : 1995
- Esfahani, H. S. 1991. Exports, Imports and Economic Growth in Semi-Industrialized Countries, *Journal of Development Economics*, 35: 93-116. .211-171 3 11 1990
- Hammad, Khalil. 1986. An Aggregate Production Function for Jordan, *METU Studies in Development*, 13 (3 and 4): 287-298. .136-103 3 6 1988
- International Monetary Fund, 2001, International Financial Statistics, Yearbook 2001. 1996
- Johnson, Harry. 1965. A Theoretical Model of Economic Nationalism in New and Developing States, *Political Sciences Quarterly*. .18-6 64 (2000-1995)
- Todaro, Michael. 1989. *Economic Development in the Third World*, Fourth Edition, Longman, New York.
- Branson, William. 1979. *Macroeconomic Theory and Policy*, (2nd edition), Harber and Row, NY.
- Chenery, Hollis and Moises Syrquin. 1975. *Patterns of*

Growth and Structural Changes in the Industrial Sector: An Econometric Analysis for the Case of Jordan (1968-2000)

*Abdel Baset Abdullah Athamneh **

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at demonstrating and analyzing the stages of industrial growth in Jordan as well as measuring the different sources of this growth. The study also aimed to analyze and measure the different sources of structural changes in the industrial sector using two econometric models, the first one measured the growth sources using the Two-Stage Least Squares method (2SLS), while the second measured the structural changes using the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS).

The results of the study showed an existence of some structural disturbance in the Jordanian industry in terms of production, employment, geographic concentration and size to the benefit of some limited industrial activities. Also, the results exhibited that economic growth and population growth correlated with the increase in the ratio of industrial production to GDP and with the ratio of the industrial labor to the total labor in a way that reflects the imbalanced development pattern which Jordan adopted concentrating on the industrial sector.

The study also showed that the growth in population, world prices, and GDP has a positive effect on the industrial growth, as opposed to the growth of the JD exchange rate against the USD. The effects of coefficients as estimated in the first model were (0.47), (0.17), (0.007) and (-0.24), consequently.

KEYWORDS: Industry, Industrial Growth, Industrial Development, Structural Changes.

*Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan. Received on 29/7/2003 and Accepted for Publication on 13/4/2004.