

DG ECFIN Seminar

"Joining the euro and then? How to ensure economic success after entering the common currency" 16 June 2015, Vilnius, Lithuania

Economic Growth and Convergence in the Baltic States: Caught in a Middle Income Trap?

Karsten Staehr Tallinn University of Technology

All viewpoints personal!

Menu

- 1) Setting the scene
- 2) Growth performance in the Baltics
- 3) Capital flows and economic growth
- 4) Puzzling data
- 5) The middle income trap

1) Setting the scene

Figure A.3: GDP per capita, Latin America, index, USA = 100



Figure A.2: GDP per capita, Asia, index, USA = 100





Figure A.1: GDP per capita, Baltic states, index, USA = 100

World Bank (2007)

- Middle income trap in some Asian countries...
 Growth spurt followed by growth slowdown
- Vivid academic and policy-oriented debate

Next 17¹/₂ minutes

Risk that Baltic states are / will be caught in middle income trap?

2) Growth performance in the Baltics

Figure 1: GDP growth, Baltic states and EU15, percent per year



Figure 2: Average GDP growth in CEE, 1995-2014, percent per year





Figure 3: GDP per capita, Baltic states and Sweden, index, EU15 = 100

2) Capital flows and economic growth

But what about the pre-crisis boom?

• Rapid economic growth \rightarrow potential for rapid growth?

Reconstruction after WWII \Rightarrow If fast growth \Rightarrow CA \downarrow \Rightarrow Measures to stop growth

"Balance of payments constraint" on short-term growth

- Thirlwall (1979), World Bank two-gap model (1960s)
- Bajo-Rubioa & Díaz-Roldán (PCE, 2009)

Short-term growth facilitated by capital flows

- Economic boom $\uparrow \Rightarrow \text{import} \uparrow \Rightarrow \text{CA} \downarrow$
- Capital inflow (CA ↓) ⇒ short-term demand ↑ ⇒ non-traded production ↑ → demand-driven economic boom

Baltic countries \rightarrow often large current account deficits

Figure 5: Current account balance, Baltic states, percent of GDP



Figure 6: Current account balance and economic growth, CEE countries, annual data 1995-2014



Panel data estimations

- 11 CEE countries
- 1995 to 2014

Dependent variable \rightarrow year-to-year economic growth Explain by:

- Current account balance (percent of GDP)
- FE + time dummies + control variables

	(1.1)	(1.2)	(1.3)	(1.4)	(1.5)	(1.6)
CA	-0.385***	-0.294***	-0.288***	-0.339*	-0.349***	-0.319***
	(0.053)	(0.103)	(0.049)	(0.184)	(0.061)	(0.044)
DUM2008	-3.512***			-2.652	-9.727***	-0.805**
	(0.410)	••	••	(1.681)	(0.348)	(0.357)
DUM2009	-10.601***			-10.110***	-16.920***	-8.407***
	(0.369)	••	••	(0.472)	(0.928)	(0.355)
DUM2010	-1.969***			-1.477***	-2.965***	-1.802***
	(0.369)	••	••	(0.507)	(0.789)	(0.372)
R^2	0.621	0.699	0.352	0.684	0.829	0.527
Countries	11	11	11	11	3	8
Time	96-14	96-14	96-07	08-14	96-14	96-14
Obs.	209	209	132	77	57	152

Table 1. Fixed effect estimations of economic growth in the CEE countries

Robust to control variables and specification changes

• CA \downarrow 1 %-point \Rightarrow short-term growth \uparrow 0.35%-points

Figure 8: Average GDP growth, 1995-2014, unadjusted and adjusted for capital flows, 11 CEE countries, percent per year



4) Puzzling data

Growth accounting

Share of per capital output growth explained by:

- Growth of capital stock
- Total factor productivity (TFP) growth

Figure 10: Gross fixed capital formation, percent of GDP



Figure 11: Growth in total factor productivity, percent per year



5) The middle income trap

Findings

- High average growth in the Baltic states ③
- High volatility 😕
- Pre-crisis boom made possible by accumulation of net foreign liabilities ⁽²⁾
- Growth slowdown after crisis (8)

If economic growth slowdown

- Why?
- Could it be long-lasting...
 - ... or will Baltic states return to 5-8% growth?

The middle income trap!

Theoretical rationalisation of the middle income trap (Agenor *et al.* 2012)

- Simple production because no highly educated specialists
- Little education because few knowledge-based jobs
 Trap!

Same reasoning

 Infrastructure, honest business practices, intellectual property rights, flexible labour markets

Empirical evidence (Eichengreen *et al.* 2013, Aiyar *et al.* 2013)

- Logit estimations on panel data for "all countries" from 1955
- Middle income gap <u>more likely</u> if:
 - Emerging from financial crisis (++)
 - Small share of population with <u>tertiary</u> education (+)
 - Large old-age dependency burden (0/+)
 - Low-tech export (++)
 - Low investment ratio (?)
 - Weak institutions (+)

My conclusion → Risk that current slowdown could evolve into longerlasting middle income gap

Measures to lower risk of middle income gap

Tertiary education

. . .

- Developing universities as research centres
- Lifelong learning
- Macroeconomic stability
- Public investment (roads, city infrastructure)
- Anti-corruption

Final comments

- Time to augment the "neoclassical growth model"?
- Time to invest into future?
- Time for more inclusive societies?
- "War of attrition"
 - Tripartite agreements in Ireland (1980s), Finland (early 1990s), South Korea (late 1990s)
- Productivity commissions"
 - Suggestions for productivity enhancing policies



Karsten Staehr Tallinn University of Technology

Homepage: <u>http://www.ttu.ee/karsten-staehr</u> E-mail: <u>karsten.staehr@ttu.ee</u>