

**EPSRC**

Engineering and Physical Sciences  
Research Council



**COOKING FUELS AND  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN  
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES:  
CASE OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA**

BY

**IFEOLUWA GARBA**



# AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- Establish existing gaps in literature on energy poverty in developing countries
- Provide empirical evidences of the impact of energy poverty on economic development in developing countries
- Recommend energy policies aimed at effectively addressing the issue.



# MOTIVATION

- Access to energy is vital in tackling global development issues
- Absence of energy in developing countries has several key aspects: lack to clean fuels for cooking and/or heating is an overlooked aspect
- More people in the world lack access to clean cooking fuel (2.7 billion) than to electricity (1.2 billion)



# 1<sup>ST</sup> STAGE – UNIT ROOT ANALYSIS

- Examine presence (non-stationary) or absence (stationary) of unit root in variables
- Stationarity means some variable statistics are constant over time: means behaviour prediction can be more accurate
- Variables must be stationary when integrated at 1<sup>st</sup> order for cointegration tests to be considered.



# 1<sup>ST</sup> STAGE – UNIT ROOT ANALYSIS

**Table 1: Results for panel unit root tests for GDP and Solid.**

		Null: Unit root				Null: No unit root		
Tests		Levin, Lin and Chu (LLC)	Im, Pesaran and Shin (IPS)	Breitung	ADF - Fisher Chi square	PP - Fisher Chi square	Hadri	z-stat
Variable								
Level	GDP	-1.1212 (0.1311)	0.8918 (0.8137)	–	2.5593 (0.8618)	0.9222 (0.9884)	3.7246 (0.0001)	3.7883 (0.0001)
	GDP (trend)	1.2035 (0.8856)	0.8443 (0.8007)	1.8563 (0.9683)	4.1453 (0.6570)	5.4072 (0.4927)	2.3169 (0.0103)	2.3335 (0.0098)
	SOLID	3.0007 (0.9987)	4.4253 (1.0000)	–	0.2544 (0.9997)	3.5888 (0.7321)	4.1189 (0.0000)	4.1257 (0.0000)
	SOLID (trend)	1.0347 (0.8496)	0.7132 (0.7621)	2.2630 (0.9882)	10.3157 (0.1120)	22.7917 (0.0009)	2.3967 (0.0083)	8.1739 (0.0000)
First difference	GDP	-1.7974 (0.0361)	-1.8103 (0.0351)	–	13.4810 (0.0360)	20.0668 (0.0027)	0.4403 (0.3299)	0.7129 (0.2379)
	GDP (trend)	-2.5189 (0.0059)	-0.4539 (0.3249)	0.6455 (0.7535)	7.3869 (0.2865)	9.9007 (0.1289)	3.6883 (0.0001)	5.0667 (0.0000)
	SOLID	-3.0472 (0.0012)	-2.6253 (0.0043)	–	22.7102 (0.0043)	21.9717 (0.0012)	0.7658 (0.2219)	2.8634 (0.0021)
	SOLID (trend)	-3.8279 (0.0001)	-2.4380 (0.0074)	- (0.1319)	20.4387 (0.0023)	25.0760 (0.0003)	4.4272 (0.0000)	8.0983 (0.0000)

# 2<sup>ND</sup> STAGE – COINTEGRATION ANALYSES

- Pedroni tests for cointegration between variables using heterogeneous panel and group mean test statistics

**Table 2: Results for Pedroni residual cointegration tests.**

Tests	Within panel statistics				Between panel statistics		
	Type		Statistic	p-value	Type	Statistic	p-value
GDP, SOLID	panel	v-	1.4016	0.0805	group	0.3668	0.6431
	statistic				rho-statistic		
	panel	rho-	-0.4226	0.3363	group	-1.6914	0.0454
	statistic				PP-statistic		
GDP, SOLID (weighted statistic)	panel	PP-	-2.2655	0.0117	group ADF-	-1.9650	0.0247
	statistic				statistic		
	panel	ADF-	-2.9228	0.0017			
	statistic						
GDP, SOLID (weighted statistic)	panel	v-	0.6680	0.2521			
	statistic						
	panel	rho-	-0.2901	0.3859			
	statistic						
GDP, SOLID (weighted statistic)	panel	PP-	-1.8934	0.0292			
	statistic						
GDP, SOLID (weighted statistic)	panel	ADF-	-1.9883	0.0234			
	statistic						



# 2<sup>ND</sup> STAGE – COINTEGRATION ANALYSES

- Kao and Fisher tests to consider cross-sectional dependency and spillage across groups

**Table 3: Results for Kao's residual cointegration test.**

Model	ADF	p-value
GDP, SOLID	-0.6996	0.2421

**Table 4: Results for Fisher-type cointegration tests.**

Null hypothesis	Fisher stat* (trace test)	p-value	Fisher stat* (max-eigen test)	p-value
$ce = 0$	27.61	0.0001	24.68	0.0004
$ce \leq 1$	10.29	0.1130	10.29	0.1130



# 3<sup>RD</sup> STAGE – LONG-RUN RELATIONSHIP ESTIMATION

- The long-run relationship between the two variables is assessed.
- The panel DOLS and FMOLS tests are applied at this stage

**Table 5: Results from DOLS and FMOLS tests.**

	Models	
	DOLS	FMOLS
Co-efficient	-61.0918	49.8929
Std.Error	3.0834	8.2559
t-statistic	-2.0307	6.0433
p-value	0.0515	0.0000





# FINAL STAGE – CAUSALITY ANALYSES

## ○ Long-run causality

**Table 6: Results for Granger causality test (L = lags).**

Independent variable	f-statistic	p-value	Sense of causality
	GDP		
SOLID (L = 1)	1.2340	0.2729	SOLID → GDP
SOLID (L = 2)	1.7639	0.1855	
SOLID (L = 5)	1.3122	0.2952	
SOLID			
GDP (L = 1)	39.2465	2e-07	GDP → SOLID
GDP (L = 2)	6.7489	0.0032	
GDP (L = 5)	2.8013	0.0418	

## ○ Short-run causality

**Table 7: Short-run causality results.**

Dependent variable	Chi-square	p-value	Sense of causality
SOLID	14.4803	0.0007	GDP → SOLID
GDP	0.7798	0.6771	SOLID → GDP



# SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

- Panel unit root analyses confirm the absence of unit root across all tests after first differencing. Variables are differenced stationary – fulfilling conditions for cointegration analyses
- 3 out of 4 cointegration tests confirm variables Solid and GDP are cointegrated
- Cointegration elasticities with GDP as dependent variable confirms negative and significant long-run relationship
- Long-run causality test with Solid as dependent variable confirms causality for optimal lag (1) and further lags
- Long-run causality with GDP as dependent variable shows no causality
- Short-run with Solid as dependent variable shows causality
- Short-run with GDP as dependent variable shows no causality



# IMPLICATIONS OF FINDING

- Energy consumption and economic development hypotheses: neutrality, conservation, growth and feedback hypotheses.
- Uni-directional causality relationship running from GDP per Capita to Solid observed.
- Findings strongly support the energy-economy conservation hypothesis for sub-Saharan Africa.
- In long-run, economic developments influence household usage of solid fuels
- In short-run, economic developments influence household usage of solid fuels



# POLICY IMPLICATION AND CONCLUSIONS

- Energy conservative policies such as traditional-fuel use reduction strategies, demand management measures, amongst others, might positively impact on the economic development.
  
- **To conclude:**
  - To address general poverty, developing countries need to address energy poverty as an aspect of the issue.
  
  - All in all, as a part of improving general economic development and addressing general poverty, it would be beneficial for countries to continue to progress from traditional cooking fuels to modern cooking alternatives.





**Thank you.**

**QUESTIONS?**

