Trade Policy and Economic Growth in Sub Saharan Africa: A Panel Data Approach

Henok Arega Asfaw

Senior Researcher at National Bank of Ethiopia, P.O.Box 5550, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

aregahenok@yahoo.com

Abstract

Despite a number of multi-country case studies utilizing comparable analytical frameworks, numerous econometric studies using large cross-country data sets, and important theoretical advances in growth theory, there is still disagreement among economists concerning how a country's international economic policies and its rate of economic growth interact. The central objective of this paper is to empirically assess the link between trade policy and economic growth in Sub Saharan Africa countries. Apart from reviewing different literatures, this study also provides empirical evidence on the relationship between economic growth and trade policies. In doing so, the study uses a panel data covering 47 Sub Saharan Africa countries over the periods 2000 – 2008. The estimation support claims that openness to international trade stimulates both economic growth and investment. Besides, trade policies such as average weighted tariff rate and real effective exchange rate have both direct and indirect impacts on economic growth.

Keywords: Tariffs, Real effective exchange rate, Growth, Cross country analysis

Introduction

Do trade policies inhibit or promote economic growth? The idea that open trade policies help poor countries is often disputed. Traditionally economists have been argued that more open economies grew quickly. However, according to Lopez (2005), neither the existing theoretical models nor the previous empirical analysis seem to have produced a definite and positive answer to this question.

Multilateral institutions such as IMF and World Bank have provided a pessimistic answer to the question, as cited in Rodrik and Rodriguez (2000). The reason for the strong bias in favor of trade openness is partly based on the conclusions of wide range of empirical studies, which claimed that outward oriented economies consistently have higher growth rate than economies with high level of restrictions.

For instance, Kruger (1998) and Stiglitz (1998) judges that countries that follow more open and "outward oriented" trade strategies exhibit empirically superior growth performance than countries with more closed and "inward oriented" policies. Oskam et al (2004) have identified three open trade policies argument: (i) open international trade transfers international prices to domestic markets of LDCs by getting the prices right and promoting market competition, which leads to efficient resource allocation; (ii) trade serves as a vehicle for transfer of knowledge, technology, capital and other physical inputs, which facilitate convergence of poor and developed economies; and (iii) Open international trade disciplines governments of LDCs to pay attention to international market prices, which may have an indirect positive effect for good governance of LDCs. Kruger and Berg (2003) suggested even that if poor countries opened more, poverty would fall.

Popularizing this view, Wacziarg and Welch (2003) argued that over the period 1950-1998, countries that have liberalized their trade regimes have experienced, on average, increase on annual growth rates by 1.5% compared to pre-liberalized times. In the neo-classical analysis of openness and growth, trade can increase the rate of technological progress, hence productivity growth, either through expansion of market for output or the market for input (Dowrick and Golley, 2004). They further explained output expansion drives growth by allowing domestic producers to exploit economies of scale and economies of specialization. In fact expansion for input market drives growth by allowing domestic producers to get access for wide variety of capital goods, which effectively enlarge the base of productive knowledge. Ann Harrison (1994) stated that greater openness is associated with higher growth.

As cited in Dowrick and Golley (2004), the study of World Bank (2002) showed that the more globalized developing countries have increased their per capita growth rate from 1% in the 1960s to 3% in the 1970s, and 4% in the 1980s to 5% in the 1990s. The World Bank qualifies the benefit of trade openness, noting that the more globalized group has been able to break into global markets for manufactured and services, rather than relying on primary commodities. In line with this view, Kruger (1986) argued that as a consequence of trade liberalization and other economic policy reforms, economic growth has accelerated in most of the developing world, with the most rapid growth in the countries whose reforms have gone furthest.

However, studies by Yanikayya (2003) showed that even though there is a positive and strong association between trade openness and growth, estimation result from trade barriers contradict the conventional view on the growth effect of trade restrictions, which suggests an adverse association between trade barriers and growth. For him, there is a positive and significant relationship between trade barriers and economic growth.

At the same time Oskam et al (2004) have identified four unfavorable arguments of open trade policies: (i) inadequate institutions, governance and infrastructure hamper (or even reverse) the positive effects of outward oriented policies; (ii) infant industry argument - the development of non-agricultural sectors in the growth process of poor countries or LFAs is crucial, not only to increase national or local income but also to absorb the migrating rural labor force, whereby it contributes in poverty alleviation; (iii) Trade driven development paths increase relative income differences and make LDCs even less competitive- countries with relative open trade policies make clear that a trade driven development path is insufficient to develop LDCs, even in situations where infrastructure and institutions are functioning rather well; and (iv) trade exposes LDCs to external (price) shocks and growth path instability. Lopez and Thirlwall (2008) have found that in the aftermath of trade liberalization, growth performance did improve in the majority of countries under study, but at the expense of trade balance deterioration.

Studies of Moore (1990) on Central America revealed that in the absence of redistribution of the return from land and capital, the impact of trade liberalization is to increase the inequality of distribution of income, and thereby an increase in the incidence of poverty. Chang (2009) in his article, *Economic History of the Developed World: Lessons for Africa*, pointed out that in terms of trade policy, with few exceptions such as Switzerland and the Netherlands, all of today's rich countries used protectionism. He believed that the success of developed countries is partly because of the adoption of infant industry protection argument. He further explained that DCs advocacy of free trade policy is an act equivalent to "kicking away the ladder", with which it climbed up to the top.

For Birdsall and Hamoudi (2002) "openness" or "closedness" is orthogonal to the problem of poor, slowing growth, commodity producing countries. Rather, they emphasised that commodity trap, which may also become poverty trap, is a significant explanatory variable for the slow economic growth of poor nations. Rodrik (2006) stated that not only the "Washington Consensus", which aimed at trade liberalization, among other things, registered very few successes in Sub Saharan, but the reform proved ill-suited to deal with the growing public health emergency in which the continent become embroiled.

According to the study of Rodrik and Rodriguez (2000) the nature of the relationship between trade policy and economic growth remains very much an open question. The issue is far from having been settled on empirical grounds. In fact they are skeptical that there is a general, unambiguous relationship between trade openness and growth. They suspect that the relationship is a contingent one, dependent on a host of country and external characteristics. In line with this view, Rodrik (1997) has argued that there are clear limitations to what trade policy, or outward orientation, can accomplish. For him growth depends primarily on investment on human resources, infrastructure, and institutions of macroeconomic management, which it takes time to achieve. Opening an economy to international trade is not a quick fix that can substitute these harder tasks. Rather, excessive emphasis on trade liberalization can backfire if it diverts the scarce energies and political resource of government leaders from the growth fundamentals.

Albeit, the issue of trade policy for developing countries is an old one, each period demands new answer to fit new circumstances and reflect new experience (Bliss, 1989). Different scholars have different views on the relationship between trade policy and growth. Some of them are skeptical (such as Rodrik and Rodriguez, 2000) about openness promote economic growth. While others (such as Frankel and Romer, 1999) argued that outward policies are the means for achieving faster economic growth. Hence, the purpose of this study is to empirically assess how trade policies can influence economic growth within the context of Sub-Saharan Africa countries.

Objectives
The general objective of this study is to empirically assess the link between trade policy and economic growth in Sub Saharan Africa countries and come up with policy recommendations for higher economic growth rate.
In accordance with this general objective, the study will have the following specific objectives:
- To present a review of theoretical and empirical literature with the aim of understanding what the existing literature says about the relationship between trade policies and economic growth;
- To empirically study whether restrictive trade policies have slow down economic growth in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Methodology
Hypothesis
The working hypothesis of this study is that trade policies have direct impact on productivity growth and it has indirect impacts that operate through investment. In the neo classical analysis of welfare gains through exploitation of comparative advantage, a reduction on trade barriers increase trade and the level of productivity, while GDP rises through the reallocation of resources and capital accumulation. In the models of endogenous technological change, open trade policies can increase the rate of technological progress, hence productivity

growth, either through expansion of the market for output or through expansion of the market for input.

Method of Analysis

As methods of analyses, the paper attempts to explain theoretically and assess empirically the impact of trade policy on economic growth. Theoretically, the entire chapter two is used to review the existing empirical and theoretical literature about the relationship between trade policies and economic growth to meet some of the objectives stated in 1.2. Empirically, the entire chapter three used econometric techniques to meet the remainder objectives. As an econometric technique, the paper employed generalized least square (GLS) estimation technique on a balanced panel data gathered for the period 2000 – 2008 to see how trade policies affect economic growth of the region.

Data

First of all, the data on trade policy in SSA are in a "sorry" state. According to Yeats (1997) data on trade in Africa is patchy and trade policy is in general tremendously difficult to measure. However, this study attempted to capture the effect of trade policy by using weighted mean average tariff rate and real effective exchange rate, where relatively consistent information are obtained. Particularly, The study utilized a balanced panel data gathered from trustworthy web sites such UN, World Bank, WDI, PWT, etc.

Delimitation of the Study

Basically, this study examines the empirical relationship between trade policies and economic growth. The study makes use of the two prominent trade restriction indices, simple trade-weighted average tariff and real effective exchange rate. Hence, inferences about the relationship between growth and other forms of trade policies are not implied from the conclusions of this study. Moreover, the empirical part of this study focuses solely on Sub-Saharan Africa region during the period 2000-2008. Hence, any definitive conclusion about other trade policies or time periods may not be made basing on the results of this study.

Literature review

Whether trade policies promote innovation in a small economy or not, depends upon if the force of comparative advantage push the economy's resources towards activities that generate long-run growth (externalities in R&D), expand product variety and improve quality, or divert them from such processes.

According to Krueger (1980),countries adopting an export-oriented trade strategy have generally experienced rapid growth of traditional exports, but even more rapid growth of non traditional exports. Experience has suggested that growth performance has been more satisfactory under export promotion strategies than under import-substitution strategies. Krueger further explains why outward oriented policies enhance economic growth compared to inward trade policies by raising the market size. According to him, domestic markets are extremely small in most developing countries, and attempts to replace imports result in the construction of many less-than-efficient minimum size new markets, while simultaneously generating an oligopolistic or monopolistic market structure. As import substitution proceeds, new activities become more capital intensive and inefficiencies from below minimum- efficient size increase. Instead export promotion permits entrepreneurs to base their plans on whatever market size seems appropriate. Moreover, given the vast disparity in capital-labor ratios of the industrial sectors of developed and developing countries, the opportunity for trade represents a means for shifting the demand for labor outward more rapidly than the import-substitution strategy.

Grossman and Helpman (1990) argued that knowledge is a public good, since non-rival and non-excludable. Hence, spillover benefit can be created in the process of innovations, where country can exploit this benefit by opening up their economies to international trade. This is because, the same idea can be used in different applications and in different locations at the same time and the origination of an idea may have difficulty extracting compensation from all agents that make use of it. This approach may facilitate hypothesis according to which international trade in tangible commodities facilitate the exchange of intangible ideas. Popularizing this view, Harrison (1994) pointed out even that openness to trade provides access to imported inputs, which embody new technology, increase the effective size of the market producers, that raising the returns of innovation.

However, in the presence of intellectual property right, the hypothesis does not hold water. For instance, at the global level, one of the most important international public law governing intellectual property rights is the 1995 Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) administered by the World Trade Organization (WTO). TRIPS reflect the interest of the intellectual property owners. TRIPS extends patent rights for 20 years, requires developing countries to offer patent protection for pharmaceuticals, sharply circumscribes the conditions under which states may issue compulsory licenses, and reduces states autonomy in crafting domestic intellectual property policies (Sell, 2007).

According to dynamic trade theory the static gains from trade - due to specialization and reallocation of *existing* resources - are small compared to the dynamic gains due to an increase in the growth rate and the volume of additional resources made available to, or employed by, the trading country (Kreinin, 1998; cited in Nowak-Lehmann (2000). Dynamic gains are caused by an accelerated accumulation of physical capital and human capital (perhaps due to a higher rate of domestic and/or foreign saving), enhanced technological transmissions and improvements in the quality of macroeconomic policy.

However, according to Lall (2000), technology cannot simply be transferred to a developing country like a physical product: its effective implantation has toinclude important elements of capability building since the simple providing of equipment and operatinginstructions, patents, designs or blueprints does not ensure that the technology will be effectivelyutilized.

Many opponents of trade openness argued that open trade policies could be detrimental to countries lagging behind technological development and have an initial comparative advantage in non-dynamic sectors. According to Rodrik and Rodriguez (2000), there is a theoretical link between trade protection policies and growth, once real world phenomena such as learning, technological change, and market imperfection are taken into account.

As more and more countries acquired their independence from their colonial powers after the end of WWII, the wide spread view to develop was industrialization by pursuing import-substitution policies. There seemed to have a number of sound reasons for support such strategy at that time. The leaders of the independent nations were aware that their colonizers had higher per capita income and are more industrialized. Besides, their rulers were taking anti-industrialization actions to keep the colonized nations underdeveloped (Baldwin, 2003). Hence, to these new leaders the issue of industrialization seems to be top agenda. An economically sensible way of achieving industrialization seemed to be restriction of imports of manufactured goods, for which there was already a domestic demand, in order both to shift this demand toward domestic producers and permit the use of the country's primary-product export earnings to import the capital goods needed for industrialization.

In addition, the impressive degrees of industrialization achieved by the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s and by China after 1949 by pursuing inward-looking policies were additional historical examples that impressed the leaders of the newly independent nations.

However, protectionism can be a dangerous tool. Apart from the cost it imposes on consumers, it in fact dilutes the incentive to invest in capability development, the process it is meant to really foster. Firms are very sensitive to competitive pressures in deciding to invest in capabilities, and the protection offered in typical import-substituting regimes tends to detract from costly and lengthy investments in competitive skills and knowledge development sector (Lall, 2000). There may be many solutions: offer limited protection; impose performance requirements; or enforce early entry into export markets while maintaining domestic protection. The lasone has the added advantage that it taps the information externalities of export activity, and was the one used by the larger Asian NIEs.

One can understand from the theoretical framework that the theoretical prediction about the link between trade policy and growth are ambiguous, highly dependent form the scenario in which they works.A potential source for the presence of an unambiguous relationship between trade barriers and growth is highlighted by a variety of theoretical models that suggest that the relationship between trade barriers and growth may be contingent on the level of development. For example, Lucas's (1988), as cited in De Jong and Ripoll (2006), skill-acquisition model of endogenous growth suggests that by allowing countries to establish a comparative advantage in the production of high-learning goods, the erection of trade barriers during early stages of development may enhance their long-term growth prospects. Young's (1991) learning-by-doing model carries similar implications, showing that the growth rate of a less-developed country may decrease in going from autarky to free trade, because comparative advantage induces these countries to specialize in goods in which the learning externality has already ceased.

Considering the ambiguities in the theoretical literature, a number of empirical studies were undertaken to examine the relationship between trade policy and economic growth. The empirical findings of many authors suggest that it is impossible to sign the effect of trade policy on growth unambiguously based on the theoretical consideration alone. Hence, the impact of either open or closed trade policy on economic growth remains a matter of empirical testing. In this paper, the relationship between trade policy and economic growth will be examined by using a panel data approach.

Model Specification, Results and Discussion

This study uses a time series cross country analysis. Roderick and Rodriguez (2000) argued robust result would be obtained on the relationship between trade policy and economic growth if one makes use of data over a decade or more. Panel data analysis allows the study of dynamic as well as cross sectional aspects of the problem. Because of this, we found that using panel data is a better way of estimation.

It is argued that there is little of policy relevance to be gained from analyzing the relationship between

current levels of development and current variable (Dowrick and Golley, 2004). Much more informative about the process of development is to examine the impact of current and lagged variables on the rate of economic growth this enabling to capture the determinant of medium run economic performance and may provide some guidance to countries seeking to raise living standard via higher rate of income growth, irrespective of their current level of development. Some of the methodology and data sources that have been used in the previous studies may prove to be useful additions to the analysis of growth rates. In particular this study includes institutional impact as a potentially important determinant of economic growth (Acemoglu et al, 2004).

Since the study focuses on the analysis of the impact of trade policy on economic growth, it makes use of average tariff rate and real effective exchange rate as the major explanatory variable. Besides, using the two prominent trade policy instruments (i.e. average tariff rate and real effective exchange rate) helps to avoid problems of multicollinearity if one uses both 'revealed openness' and 'policy openness' together as an explanatory variable in a single equation, which may lead to unreliable estimates with high standard errors and of unexpected sign or magnitude (Verbeek, 2004). The paper also wants to distinguish the direct impact of trade policy on growth and the indirect impact that operates through investment.

Hence, the study attempts to estimate a structural model consisting of a growth equation, an investment equation and an equation explaining openness. The growth equation allows estimating the direct impact of policy measures on per capita income and investment equation and an equation explaining openness helps to measure the indirect effect of trade policy that operating through investment.

The estimating equation in standard form based on Dowrick and Golley (2004), is given as follows:

(1) Growth real GDP per capita

$$lnY_{it} = \eta_0 + \eta_1 lnOPENit + \eta_2 lnLB_{it} + \eta_3 ln(I/Y)_{it} + u_{it}..............eq(1)$$

(2) Investment ratio

$$ln(I/Y)_{it} = \delta_0 + \delta_1 lnY_{it} + \delta_2 lnOPEN_{it} + \delta_3 INST_{it} + \delta4 lnPI/P_{it} + v_{it}...............eq(2)$$

(3) Trade Ratio

$$lnOPEN_{it} = \theta_0 + \theta_1 GEO_i + \theta_2 lnTARit + \theta_3 lnREER_{it} + \theta_4 lnPOP_{it} + \theta_5 POPDNST_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}...eq(3)$$

Where Y is Real GDP per Capita

LB is Active Labour Force

I/Y is Investment GDP ratio

TAR is Average Tariff Rate

REER is Real Effective Exchange Rate

OPEN is Openness (Ratio of Trade to GDP)

PI/P is Ratio of Price of Investment Goods to Price of GDP

GEO is Geographic Factor

INST is Institutional Quality

POP is Total Population

POPDNST is Population Density

The subscript "i" indexes countries, the subscript t indicate the time period, and the absence of a time subscript shows that the variables are averaged over the whole period. The system of equation is recursive, allowing us to use single equation estimation if there is no correlation between the error terms – a condition in which we test. The point estimate of the direct impact of openness on economic growth is 'η_1'. The indirect impact of openness that operates through investment channel is 'δ_2'. The impact of trade policy variables on economic growth is captured by the formula $(\theta_2 + \theta_3)(\eta_1 + \delta_2)$.

The diagnosis tests result indicates that there is high autocorrelation and hetroskedasticity problem in the model. Therefore, using fixed effects or random effect model may result in inefficient estimates. With the presence of autocorrelation and hetroskedasticity problems' using the Feasible Generalized Least Square (FGLS) estimation technique is appropriate to come up with efficient estimates. Hence, the model specified in this paper is estimated with FGLS estimation method using annual data for the period 2000-2008.

Regarding the growth equation all the variables are found to be statistically significant. The sign of the labor force, investment output ratio and openness is positive as expected. Openness is significant at 10% significance level but both labor force and investment are significant at 1% level of significance. The overall trade share is an important explanatory variable of growth in addition to human and physical capital.

The significance of openness variable implies that country's economic growth is positively correlated with the more open the economy to the global market. A one percent increase in openness will result in 1.81 percent increase in economic growth. Moreover, a higher human and physical capital is positively correlated with economic growth. However, the marginal contribution of an increase in physical capital for economic **growth is larger as compared to the marginal contribution to human capital.**

We have found out that share of real investment in GDP contributes significantly to growth. We have also seen that openness positively and significantly affect economic growth. However, it is possible that openness may have additional, indirect effect on economic growth, operating through the investment

channel.

TABLE 3.1: GROWTH REGRESSION ESTIMATES
Dependent Variable: Log of Growth Rate of Real GDP per capita

Independent Variable	Coefficient	z-ratio	p-value
ln of (openness)	0.2254684	3.21	0.063*
ln of (investment output ratio)	0.4363692	6.12	0.000***
ln of (labour force)	0.3751579	2.21	0.001***

Number of observations = 289
Number of groups = 41
Wald $chi^2(10)$ = 40.22
Prob> chi^2 = 0.0000

* Significant at 10%, ** Significant at 5% and *** Significant at 1%

Table 3.2 summarizes the result of our investment regression, following the specification of equation (2). With the exception of institutional quality all the remaining variables are significant at 1% and 5% level of significance. We confirm the finding of Dowrick and Golley (2004) that the price of investment goods relative to GDP has a significant negative impact on investment. Both GDP growth rate and openness have positive sign as it is expected. By looking at the effect of openness on investment it can be argued that more open economies are conducive for the growth of investment. The positive effect of openness on investment could be attributed through the transfer of technology as the neo-classical economists argued. A 10 percent increase in trade share is predicted to increase the investment rate by 5.37 percent. The overall impact of openness on economic growth is the sum of the direct and indirect effect. The magnitude of the indirect effect is the product of two regression coefficients $\eta_3 * \delta_2$ **(0.25), which is positive and considerable in magnitude.** Moreover, the insignificance coefficient of institutional quality deviates from both our expectation and what the other studies, such as Dowrick and Golley (2004), on the issue states.

We have seen that variations in trade intensity do have a significant effect on economic growth. This raises the question of what factors influence a country's trade share and what the role of policy instruments might be.

TABLE 3.2: INVESTMENT REGRESSION ESTIMATES
Dependent Variable: Log of Investment Output Ratio

Independent Variable	Coefficient	z-ratio	p-value
ln of(real GDP per capita)	0.0246599	2.27	0.023**
ln of (price of investment to price of GDP ratio)	-1.90e-0.07	2.68	0.007***
Institutional quality	0.0015671	0.73	0.466
ln of (openness)	0.5370963	8.47	0.000***

Number of observations = 289
Number of groups = 41
Wald $chi^2(10)$ = 58.17
Prob> chi^2 = 0.0008

* Significant at 10%, ** Significant at 5% and *** Significant at 1%

The regression estimates of table 3.3 presents the determinants of an openness. We find that, with the exception of population density, all the remaining variables are found to be significant. This means that higher density does seem to allow more opportunity for internal trade, hence reducing the need for foreign trade. However, a larger population seems to increase foreign trade. As it is expected, the sign of mean weighted average tariff rate and real effective exchange rate is negative. This implies that these trade policies seem to lower the degree of openness. This is because, as in the case of tariff, it restrains both the volume of import and export. Devaluation, so as to promote export, seems to negatively affect openness. Hence, this suggests that trade policies that restricts openness negatively affect economic growth.

TABLE 3.3: OPENNESS REGRESSION ESTIMATES
Dependent Variable: Log of Openness

Independent Variable	Coefficient	z-ratio	p-value
Geographic factor	0.2055576	5.34	0.000***
ln of (population)	-0.1691782	-11.48	0.000***
Population density	-0.0003325	-1.55	0.120
ln of (tariff)	-0.0242287	-1.84	0.065*
ln of (real effective exchange rate)	-0.0181822	-2.06	0.039**

Number of observations = 386
Number of groups = 43
Wald $chi^2(10)$ = 244.86
Prob> chi^2 = 0.0000

* Significant at 10%, ** Significant at 5% and *** Significant at 1%

Both of the above findings echo the findings of Wacziarg and Welch (2003) and David and Loewy (1998). Finally, we also find that the sign of the coefficient landlocked is positive and statistically significant at % level of significance, which is in line with our prior expectation. Being a country with sea outlets encourages openness. To put it differently, countries that have access to sea outlets trade more in the global market.

Conclusions and Implications

The macroeconomic impact trade policy on growth and development has entertained a hot debate in the literature. Empirical studies on the matter have employed diverse methodologies and ideologies. Much like the diversity of their approaches, so have been the results obtained. For the most part, these studies have arrived at conflicting pieces of evidence and the dispute seems to have continued without showing any tendency of begetting a common understanding.

This paper attempted to examine the impact of trade policy on economic growth in Sub Saharan African countries, utilizing a panel data approach employingGeneralised Least Square Estimator (GLS), consisting of 47 countries between the periods 2000 to 2008.

The main findings of the analysis are openness to international trade stimulates economic growth and investment. Both the direct and indirect effect of openness in promoting economic growth is found to statistically significant. This implies that an increase in trade does, on average, benefits on economic growth of SSA countries. This also entails that outward-oriented economies exhibit faster economic growth. Tariff barriers do affect the level of trade, hence economic growth.

Looking into the relationship between revealed openness and investment, it shows that there is positive and significant relationship between these variables. This suggests that opportunities for international trade raise the marginal product of investment. Moreover, access to sea outlets raises the marginal product of openness. However, in the investment share regression institutional quality remains to be statistically insignificant.

Finally, even though, our results do appear to be robust, a note of caution must be made since the results that are presented in the finding part are potentially sensitive to econometric approaches. From our findings, it could be argued that SSAshould liberalize their trade to attain a faster economic growth, as in the case of IMF and WB advocators. However, doing so without introducing appropriate complementary policies, trade reform alone cannot serve as magic solution. Hence, further research is clearly required to disentangle these hypotheses in order to provide clear policy guidance for the future.

Bibliography

Acemoglu, D. and J. A. Robinson, J. A. (2005) 'Institutions as the fundamental cause for long-run growth', *Handbook of Economic Growth*.

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. and Robison, J. (2001), 'The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation', *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 91, No. 5, pp: 1369 -1401

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. and Robison, J. (2004), 'Institutions as a Fundamental Cause of Long-run Growth', *NBER working paper series*, No. 10481

Ackah, C. and Morrissey, O. (2006), 'Trade Liberalization Is Good If You Are Rich', *Credit Research Paper*, No. 07/01

Addis A. (2008), 'Trade Liberalization and Economic Growth: a Bound Test Approach', MA Project, School of Economics, Addis Ababa University

Afonso, O. (2001), 'The Impact of International Trade on Economic Growth', *NBER Working Paper*, No. 106

Alemayehu G. (2009), 'Fundamentals of International Economics for Developing Countries: A Focus on Africa, Volume 1: Trade Theory and Policy', *Africa Economic Research Consortium*, Nairobi, Kenya

Alemayehu, G., NjugunaN'dung'u and D. Zerfu. (2009), 'Applied Time Series Econometrics: A Practical Guide For Macroeconomic Researchers With A Focus on Africa', Addis Ababa University and AERC (Unpublished).

Anderson, J.E. and Marcouiler, D. (1999), 'Trade, Location and Security: an Empirical Investigation', *NBER Working Papers*, No. 7000

Anderson, J.E. and Van Wincoop, E. (2001), 'Borders, Trade, and Welfare', *Brooking Trade Forum*, pp: 207 – 243

Baldwin, R. (2003), 'Openness and Growth: What is the Empirical Relationship?',*NBER Working Paper,* No. 9578

Baltagi, Badi H. (2005), 'Econometric Analysis of panel Data', 3rd edition.John Wiley &Sons Ltd. West Sussex, England.

Ben-David, D. (1996), 'Trade and Convergence Among Countries', *Journal of international Economics*, 40,279-298

Birdsall, N. And Hamoudi, A. (2002), 'Commodity Dependence, Trade and Growth: When Openness is Not Enough', *Centre for Global Development*, No. 7

Bliss, C. (1989), 'Trade and Development', *Handbook of Development Economics*, Amsterdam, North Holland

Brunetti A. and Wedder, B. (1998), 'Investment, and Institutional Uncertainty: A Comparative study of Different Uncertainty Measures', *WelwirtschaftichesArchiv*, Vol. 134, No. 3, pp: 513 – 533

Chang, H. (2009), 'Economic History of Developed World: Lesson for Africa', A Lecture Delivered in the Eminent Speakers Program of African Development Bank, University of Cambridge

David, B. and Loewy, D. (1999), 'Free Trade, Growth and Convergence', *Journal of Economic Growth*, 3:143 – 399

DeJong, D.N. and Ripoll, M. (2006), 'Tariff and Growth, An Empirical Exploration of Contingent Relationship', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, University of Pittsburgh

Devereux, M.B. (1997), 'Growth, Specialization and Trade Liberalization', *International Economic Review*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp:565 – 585

Dollar, D. (1992), 'Outward-Oriented Developing Economies Really Do Grow More Rapidly: Evidence from 95 LDCs, 1976 - 1985', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, pp: 523 – 544

Dollar, D. and Kraay, A. (2002), 'Institutions, Trade, and Growth', *The World Bank*, Carnegie – Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy, (Forthcoming)

Dollar, D. and Kraay, A. (2004), 'Trade Growth and Poverty', *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 114, No. 493, pp: 22 – 49

Dowrick, S. and Golley, J. (2004), 'Trade Openness and Growth: Who Benefits?',*Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp:38 – 56

Edward, S. (1997), 'Openness, Productivity and Growth, What Do We Really Know?',*NBER Working Paper Series*, No. 5978

Edward, S. (1998), 'Openness, Productivity, Growth: What Do We Really Know?',*Economic Journal*, 18, 383 – 398

Frankel, J. and Romer, D. (1999), 'Does Trade Cause Growth?',*The American Economic Review*, Vol. 89, No. 3, pp:379 – 399

Grossman, G.M. and Helpman, E. (1990), 'Trade, Innovation and Growth', *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 80, No. 2, pp: 86 – 91

Gujarati, D. (2004), 'Basic Econometrics', 4th Ed., the McGraw Hill Company

Harrison, A. (1994), 'Openness and Growth: A Time Series Cross Country Analysis for Developing Countries', *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 48, pp: 419 – 447

IMF (1997), 'World Economic Outlook', Washington, DC.

Kreinin, M.E. (1998), 'International Economics: A Policy Approach', 8th Ed., Fort Worth, Tex, Dryden Press

Krueger, A. (1986), 'Problems of Liberalization', in Economic Liberalization of Developing Countries, Basil Blackwell INC, New York

Krueger, A. and Berg, A. (2003), 'Trade, Growth, and Poverty: A Selective Survey', *IMF Working Paper*, WP/03/30

Krueger, Anne O., 'Why Trade Liberalisation is Good for Growth,' *The Economic Journal*, 108, September 1998, 1513-1522.

Krueger, K. O. (1980), 'Trade Policy as an Input to Development', The*American Economic Review*, Vol. 70, No. 2, pp: 288 – 292

Lall, S. (2000), 'Selective Industrial and Trade policies in Developing Countries: Theoretical and Empirical Issue', *QEH Working Paper*, No. 48

Lee, G. (2009), 'International Economics: Trade and protectionism', *Lecture Notes*, Vol. 1, Singapore

Lee, J. (1993), 'International Trade, Distortions, and Long-run Economic Growth', *International Monetary Fund*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp: 299 – 328

Locus, R.E. (1988), 'On the Mechanism of Economic Development', *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22.1, 3 – 42

Lopez, P. and Thirtwall, A. (2008), 'Trade Liberalization, The Balance of Payments, and Growth in Latin America', *International Review of Applied Economics*

Lopez, R. (2005), 'Trade and Growth: Reconciling the Macroeconomic and Microeconomic Evidence', *Journal of Economic Survey,* Vol. 19, No. 4, pp: 623 – 648

Matteis, A.D. (2004), 'International Trade and Economic Growth in a Global Environment', *Journal of International Development*, J. Int. Dev. 16, pp:575 – 588

Mauro, P. (1995) 'Corruption and growth', Quarterly Journal of Economics, 110: 681-712.

Meon, P. and Sekkat, K. (2006), 'institutional Quality and Trade: Which Trade? Which Institutions?', University of Brussels

Moore, R. (1990), 'Can Trade Liberalization Lead to an Increase in Poverty in Central Africa?',*Journal of Economic Development*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp:83 – 92

Navas-Ruiz, A. (2007), 'On Trade Openness, Institutional Change and Economic Growth', University of Carlos III, Madrid

North, D. C. (1990) 'Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance', Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.

Nowak-Lehamn D.F. (2000), 'Trade Policy and Its Impact on Economic Growth: Can Openness Speed Up Output Growth?', Discussion Paper No. 7, Centre for Europeanization and Globalization of the Economy

Olson, M., Sarna, N. and Svamy, A.V. (2000), 'Governance and Growth: a Simple Hypothesis Explaining Cross-Country Differences in Productivity Growth', *Public Choice*, Vol. 102, No. 3 – 4, pp: 341 – 364

Onafowora, O.A. and Owoye, O. (19980, 'Can Trade Liberalization Stimulate Economic Growth in Africa?',*World Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp: 497 – 506

Oskam, A., Komen, M., Wobst, P. and Yalew, A. (2004), Trade Policies and Development of Less Favoured Area: Evidence from Literature', *Science Direct, Food policy*, No. 29, pp: 445 – 466

Rodriguez, F. and D. Rodrik (2000) 'Trade Policy and Economic Growth: A sceptic's Guide to Cross-National Evidence', *NBER working paper,* No. 7081.

Rodrik, D. (1992), 'The Limits of Trade Policy Reform in Developing Countries', *The Journal of Economic Perspective*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp:87 – 105

Rodrik, D. (1997), 'Trade Policy and Economic Performance of Sub Saharan Africa', Harvard university

Rodrik, D. (2006), 'Good Bye Washington Consensus and Hello Washington Confusion', Harvard University, Unpublished

Roe, T., Somwaru, A. and Diao, X. (2003), 'Developing Aspect to Trade Policy Analysis: Does One Size Fit All', Paper Prepared for the Conference WTO, Competing Policy Issue and Agenda for Agriculture Trade, Washington, DC

Sachs, J. and Warner, A. (1995), 'Economic Reform and the Process of Global Integration', *Brooking Papers on Economic Activity*, 1, 1 – 118

Sell, S.K. (2007), 'TRIPS Plus Free Trade Agreement and Access to Medicine', *Liverpool Law Review*, 28:41 – 75

Stiglitz, Joseph E. (1998), 'Towards a New Paradigm for Development: Strategies, Policies, and Processes,' 1998 Prebisch Lecture at UNCTAD, Geneva.

Tilahun, M. (2010), 'Corruption and Economic Growth: an Empirical Study of SSA', a Master Thesis, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

UNCTAD (2008), 'Export Competitiveness and Development in LDCs: Policies, Issues and Priorities for LDCs for Action During Beyond UNCTAD XII

Verbeek, Marno (2004), 'A Guide to Modern Econometrics'. 2nd Ed. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd. New York, USA.

Wacziarg, R. and Welch, K. H. (2003), 'Trade Liberalization and Growth: New Evidence', Stanford University

Winters, L.A. (2004), 'Trade Liberalization and Economic Performance: An Overview', *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 114, No. 493, pp: F4 – F12

Wooldridge, J. M. (2004), 'Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach', Cincinnati, OH: South Western.

World Bank (2002), 'Globalization, Growth and Poverty', New York, Oxford University Press

Yanikkaya, H. (2003), 'Trade Openness and Growth: A Cross Country Empirical Investigation', *Journal of Development Economics*, No. 72, pp: 57 – 89

Yeats, A.J. (1997), 'Implications of the Quality of African Trade Statistics for the Formulation of Effective Regional Integration and Trade Policies', papered prepared for the ECA meeting of African Trade Ministers, Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire

Young, A. (1991), 'Learning by Doing and the Dynamic Effect of International Trade', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May, pp: 369 – 405

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/ All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

Academic conference: http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar