

**A Comparative Study on the Impact of Telecommunication
Investment on Economic Growth in EU vis-à-vis non-EU
OECD countries: A Dynamic Panel Data Analysis**

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

ABSTRACT

This study aims to comparatively investigate the effects of telecommunication infrastructure on the economical growth in OECD countries. For this purpose, OECD countries were divided into two groups i.e. European Union (EU) and non-EU OECD countries for the period of 1993-2013. Findings of dynamic panel data model showed that investment on the telecommunication infrastructure has more positive effect on EU OECD countries than non-EU OECD countries. Since telecom appears as the key sector to fuel growth because it is associated with information technology and all ramifications of computer based applications and mobile communication, all countries at all development levels are proposed to focus on investing in these sectors the opposite of which hinders growth.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Keywords: Telecommunication; privatization; economic growth; dynamic panel data; European Union.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

1. INTRODUCTION

Economic growth is defined as an increase in the level of goods and services produced, compared from one period of time to another. Growth models are used to identify inter-country income level difference. All countries, especially developing ones, intend to support economic growth for their citizens to enjoy higher living standards. Production gap between countries is widely explained by main factors of production and other determinants like technology, foreign direct investment and international trade. Although the effects of the factors differ from country to country, it is well-known that mentioned factors have significant impact on economic growth. For example, skilled labor force has a positive impact on production efficiency and labor force in developed countries is more qualified in comparison to developing countries. Similar to the labor force, capital is another factor that is categorized as physical, human, and financial capital.

In addition to labor force and capital, foreign direct investment (FDI) is also asserted as a vital determinant. FDI, defined as the flow of investment from one country to another, brings along technology and productivity. According to World Investment Report [1], global FDI declined in 2014 in comparison to 2013 due to fragility of world economy, political uncertainties and geopolitical risks. In spite of this decline in FDI, Gross Domestic Product (GDP), trade, and gross fixed capital have grown. Despite the fact that positive influence of FDI on economic growth has been widely verified, there are also number of papers revealing the contradictory outcomes. For example, Herzer [2] analysed the effect of FDI on economic growth in 44 developing countries. Adopting the general-to-specific methodology and reports a negative effect, but also large cross-country differences. Mencinger [3] likewise finds that

42 FDI has a negative impact on economic growth, with causality unidirectional from FDI to
43 growth. In his study, Alfaro [4] emphasized that impact of FDI can drastically decouple
44 between sectors. According to his findings, while FDI has a positive impact on growth in
45 manufacturing sector, this impact is negative in primary business sector. Distinction of this
46 impact is associated with the presence of bureaucracy in relevant sector, its cost and the
47 economic structure of host country. Lyroudi et al. [5] find that FDI may raise investment and
48 consumption but at the same time, it may lower growth rate due to impairment of prices or
49 misallocation.

50
51 The reason why FDI is considered as an important determinant of economic growth is that it
52 has a substantial role in fostering economic growth via transferring innovation, and capital in
53 terms of financial and physical, and creating employment [6]. It is also asserted in other
54 studies that telecommunication is a sector that benefits from FDI inflow [7, 8].
55

56 Compared to other infrastructure sectors, telecommunication itself has a more dynamic
57 market structure. For instance, even during an economic crisis, consumers benefit from
58 telecommunication services. Therefore, one of the crucial factors affecting economic growth
59 is the development of telecommunication infrastructure. The crux of the telecommunication
60 sector's impact on economic growth is also related to penetration, productivity and
61 privatization of the sector. The position of telecommunication sector in economy has
62 changed over time; new policies have been determined according to market structure. In
63 1960s, many developing countries nationalized their telecommunication tool providers.
64 During 1980s, there was a trend towards privatization rather than nationalization. Although
65 the reasons for this trend vary in each country, they can be summarized under three
66 headings: (i) state-controlled telecommunication companies displaying poor performance. (ii)
67 international organizations' pressure on countries for privatization, for example; World Bank
68 was reserving fund for infrastructure investments in 1960s, for organization and
69 management reforms in 1970s, for sectoral reforms including privatization in 1980s. (iii)
70 tendency to remove institutions from state monopoly.
71

72 Moreover, during the rule of Thatcher (1979-1990), eliminating state monopoly many
73 institutions in England were privatized [9]. Meanwhile, international organizations made
74 agreements, and the most renowned of these was Agreement on Basic Telecommunications
75 which was signed by 72 members of World Trade Organization (WTO) on February 5, 1998.
76 The most important reason for this and other similar agreements was to provide room for
77 foreign investors. The EU acquis place no limitation on foreign ownership in between the EU
78 borders, albeit the OECD members out of the EU still have some substantial localizations
79 on. These restrictions prevent the contributions to some sectors, especially
80 telecommunication. However, ensuing privatization policies and infrastructural efforts
81 boosted competitiveness. The restrictions in OECD member countries outside the EU are
82 shown in Table 1. Until mid-1990s, integration in the telecommunication industry in Europe
83 was vertical, productivity was low and state-controlled. The formation of a competitive
84 environment in this field depended on privatization and infrastructure investments. To
85 increase productivity, it was decided that an "externalization strategy" would be followed.
86 This decision aimed at income growth and also it was a means of providing FDI flow [10].
87 The EU competitiveness policies had a significant role in the liberalization of
88 telecommunication.
89

90 **Table1. Restrictions in the Telecommunication Sector in non-EU OECD Countries**
91

Countries	Restriction, Explanations
Australia	After the privatization of Telstra, the largest operator of Australia, aggregate foreign ownership was limited to 35%, individual foreign ownership was limited to

	5%.
Brazil	In Brazil, foreign ownership in public telecommunication companies is limited to a maximum of 49%.
Canada	Foreigners cannot own more than 46% of voting shares in telecommunication carrier. Moreover, a certain part of administrative body must consist of Canadian citizens.
Chile	There are no foreign ownership restrictions with one exception: only up to 10% of radio broadcasting companies can be owned by foreign companies.
Iceland	There are no restrictions.
Israel	There are rules such as the nationality of the members of administrative body, residence clauses, more than 75% of administrators must be of Israeli nationality or consist of those residing in Israel.
Japan	There are no restrictions for individuals or institutions to invest in public telecommunication operator (operators) in Japan. Nevertheless, share of foreign capital for Nippon Telegraph and Telephone (NTT) is limited to less than one third (directly and/or indirectly).
Korea	Foreign ownership cannot be more than 49% of securities issued.
Mexico	Concessions are for Mexican nationals only. Foreign investment cannot exceed 49% except for cellular telephone service.
New Zealand	There are no restrictions for other operators but no company can own more than 49, 9% of New Zealand Telecom Company.
Norway	The state holds majority of the shares.
South Africa	Even though there are no direct foreign investment restrictions, foreign ownership in radio or television is limited to 20%.
Switzerland	The federal state must hold majority of the shares in Swisscom, the telecommunication company of Switzerland.
Turkey	There are no restrictions.

Source: OECD [61]; ICT Regulation Toolkit [62]; Pretorius [63.]

92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115

The internet and its technologies are massively used for their trade agreements, trade, and market researches in today's companies. Not only companies but also customers get in touch with companies by means of the internet, and they do online shopping. The revenues provided by this expanding market are thought as telecommunication revenues [11]. Telecommunication revenues declined by 4% between 2014 and 2015 in the world. However, developing countries experienced a compound annual growth rate in telecommunication revenue of 6.6% in the period 2007-2015 [12].

According to the estimated data of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the number of individuals using internet will be 3.5 billion, and of which 2.5 billion will be from developing countries in 2017 [12]. Technically speaking, number of internet users in developing countries has widely outscored internet users in developed countries by experiencing average growth rate of 16.7% between 2006 and 2017, whereas this rate is 4.3% for developed countries.

Global growth rate for telecommunication between 2001 and 2017 is given in Figure 1. Accordingly, the highest increase has been in the number of mobile phone subscribers (15.5 % in 2001, 103.5 % in 2017), and the highest decline has been in the number of fixed line subscribers. Mobile broadband segment which stands out with its dynamic structure has grown more than 20% annually in the last five years. Compared to 2007, it has increased fourteen times and it is expected to reach 4.3 billion globally by end 2017 [12].




Figure 1. Global ICT Developments, 2001-2017.

Source: ITU World Telecommunication / Global ICT Developments [64], *Estimated

116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149

When it is looked at the perspective of global improvements, it can be seen easily that telecommunication sector keeps its dynamic structure even in time of economic crisis. By the marketization of this sector and some regulations made, countries have aimed at gearing up, addressing more people, reducing costs, increasing revenues, attracting foreign investors and reducing budget deficit. Another benefit is decreasing state incentives and that this paves the way for states to switch to areas where they can have a comparative advantage. Thus, states allocate all their energy to areas where they can use it more efficiently [13].

It is also mentioned that telecommunication sector can promote spread of market, also increase efficiency of both markets and administration of companies by reducing cost of information, variable cost of market participation and operation, and lowering uncertainty in Less Developed Countries (LCD) [14]. Not only does telecommunication involve fixed line but also many areas like mobile phones, internet, cable TV. Therefore, an investment made in telecommunication sector speed up integration and give rise to a more reliable information network. Especially with the increasing use of the internet, transaction costs have been reduced even more.

According to Thompson and Garbacz [15] who studied the impact of broadband penetration on economic growth, there are direct and indirect impacts of the internet on economic growth. Because along with the developments in communication, entrepreneurs in geographically far away countries gather in a market established in a larger network and they get into competition globally. Competition leads to the emergence of different products in similar sectors and appreciation of these products in the global market. This situation takes place not only in goods and services market but also in financial markets. Market integration also induces some positive effects on increasing export, technology flow and income. Regarding information and communication technologies (ICT's) Eggleston et al. [16] suggested that there is a means-end based reasoning from information technology to economic growth through disseminating information and creating effective markets as described in Figure 2 below.




Figure 2. The Digital Provide
Source: Eggleston et al. (2002).

151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186

Jensen [17] also emphasizes the inevitable impact of telecommunication sector by indicating “information makes markets work” in his micro level survey. In their studies, Roller and Waverman [18] state that telecommunication infrastructure is pretty different from other infrastructures in terms of forming network externality. In other words, the higher the number of users is, the more benefit users get, and the more competitive market gets.

The main purpose of this research is to compare the impact of telecommunication on economic growth according to country groups in the OECD. This paper investigates and analyses whether telecommunication infrastructure is a leading determinant of factors behind the economic growth within these country groups. It also seeks an answer to “Do the effects of telecommunication infrastructural investments vary in different groups?”. For this purpose, OECD countries are categorized into two groups as the EU and non-EU countries. Some decisions are taken and goals set in the EU countries are legally obligatory in member countries. Therefore, member countries determine their national policies in accordance with these goals. After the removal of national border controls and impermeabilities where they share their sovereignty, basically to increase production efficiency and to minimize regional disparities. Nevertheless, this kind of novelty does not exist in non-OECD countries.

One of the main features of this study is that, a comparative analysis of telecommunication infrastructural investments in EU and non-EU OECD countries are assessed. Additionally, the answer to “*Is being a member of the EU OECD countries more advantageous?*” also searched in the sense of economic growth in telecommunication factor. This is important for both groups of countries in the OECD. As it is known, the EU has made a couple of regulations under competition policy in the telecommunication sector as in many other areas. These regulations have removed restrictions and eased investment in EU countries more flexibly. The main contribution of this research is to unveil whether developments in telecommunication sector lead to more economic growth in EU vis-à-vis non-EU OECD countries.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses the previous literature. In this chapter, studies contributing to literature is analysed. Section 3 presents the dynamic panel data method. Section 4 comprises description of data, test results and adequacy of the

187 model, Section 5 is about discussion on research findings related to the relevant method and
188 in the final section, conclusion is posed along with suggestions for future works.

189

190 **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

191

192 Just after liberalization, majority of developed countries headed for privatization and reforms
193 in infrastructure sectors like telecommunication. In order to engage in global competition,
194 developing countries have recently started privatizing in these sectors. Prior to privatizations
195 they harmonized their technologies and amended their laws/regulations accordingly.
196 Telecommunication investments result in various consequences according to development
197 level of countries. One of the pioneering studies in this field was penned by Jipp [19] who
198 identifies the meaningful and positive correlation between number of telephones and GDP in
199 underdeveloped and industrialized countries. Hardy [20] examines the impact of a number of
200 telephone lines on economic growth in 60 countries for the years between 1960 and 1973.
201 Considering his findings, there is a positive and meaningful effect of telecommunication with
202 the number of telephone lines for developed and developing countries, but the impact is
203 found to be greater in the latter group of countries, while there is no impact of radio
204 investment.

205

206 Literature also involves studies employing causality and production function in order to
207 identify the relationship between growth and telecommunication. For instance, Dvornic and
208 Sabolic [21] attempt to find out whether telecommunication investments in Eastern European
209 countries with transition economies affect growth or not; in other words, they try to answer
210 the following two questions “Are telecommunication investments in these countries the
211 cause or the result of economic growth?”, and “Are developments in telecommunication
212 market the cause or the result of economic growth?”. In this respect, the association
213 between telecommunication services and growth for the period 1991-2001 is examined with
214 Granger causality test. Existence of causality from telecommunication investments to GDP is
215 observed. That’s to say, telecommunication investments influence GDP. In case of a three-
216 year delay, bilateral causality is identified between developments in telecommunication
217 market and GDP. Wolde-Rufael [22] analyzes the correlation between telecommunication
218 investments and economic growth for the period 1947-1996. According to Toda &
219 Yamamoto test, bilateral causality is found out. Pradhan et al. [23] examine the correlation
220 between developments in telecommunication infrastructure and economic growth in G-20
221 countries for the period 1991-2012. In the research which employed Panel VAR model and
222 Granger causality test, estimations are made for developed countries, developing countries
223 and G-20 countries on an individual basis. Considering their findings, there is a bilateral
224 causality between telecommunication infrastructure and growth in developing and developed
225 countries in the long run. In both of the groups, economic growth is the most significant
226 determinant of FDI. However, developments in telecommunication infrastructure aren’t
227 meaningful determinants of FDI. The meaningful correlation between growth and
228 telecommunication has been revealed by the majority of the studies examining causality.

229

230 In contrast to findings of bilateral causality, there are also a number of studies that
231 championing the existence of one-way causality from telecommunication to GDP. For
232 example, Dutta [24] emphasizes that there is a substantial causality pattern from
233 telecommunications to economic activity for both 15 industrialized and 15 developing
234 countries over the 1970-1993 period. He also indicates that evidence of causality is found to
235 be weaker in the opposite direction. Chakraborty and Nandi [25] associate the existence of
236 one way causality from tele-density to GDP with a low degree of privatization in 12
237 developing countries in Asia. Kumar et al. [26] analyse the effects of telecommunication on
238 product output per person employed in Pacific Small Island Countries between 1979 and
239 2012. When it is viewed in terms of causality, one-way causality from telecommunication to

240 production per person employed is identified. According to the findings of the research,
241 telecommunication has contribution in per capita output both in short and long run. Existence
242 of causality in opposite direction is also presented by some studies such as Shiu and Lam
243 [27] who asserted the nexus from telecommunication to GDP in China and its regions for the
244 period 1978-2004. According to the findings of the research, one-way causality from real
245 GDP to developments in telecommunication is identified both at the national level and in the
246 parts of the eastern region where welfare level is high.
247

248 In addition to the analyses of causality, some studies attempt to explain the impact of the
249 sector on output. For example, Datta and Agarwal [28] explore the long-term relationship
250 between growth and telecommunication infrastructure in 22 OECD countries over 1980-
251 1992. In this regard, the dynamic stable panel model is employed as the estimation method.
252 For telecom infrastructure, stock number reaching a hundred lines was employed. According
253 to the findings, the relationship between telecom infrastructure and real GDP per capita is
254 found to be positive and meaningful. Another result they propose is the presence of
255 diminishing returns in telecommunication infrastructure. Considering this result, developing
256 countries will make more profit from telecommunication infrastructure expenditures. In
257 alignment with this finding, Yildiz [29] reveals that telecommunication investment has a
258 positive impact on economic growth and there is a bilateral causality according to Granger
259 test result for OECD countries over 1990-2009. It is also found with fixed effect model that
260 telecommunication investment and income, foreign trade volume, public expenditures and
261 fixed capital investment have a positive impact on economic growth. Furthermore, Roller and
262 Waverman [18] examine whether effects of telecommunication distinguish between OECD
263 countries and non-OECD countries by establishing four different models for the period 1970-
264 1990. Accordingly, they identified that there is a strong and positive link between GDP and
265 telecommunication; telecommunication infrastructure may not have a linear effect on growth
266 and telecommunication may have more influence on growth in OECD countries in
267 comparison to non-OECD countries.
268

269 Batuo [30] studies the impact of telecommunication investment on economic growth for 44
270 African countries between 1990 and 2010 employing panel data model with Least Squares
271 and Generalized Method of Moments. According to the findings, telecommunication
272 infrastructure has a positive effect on growth. As for the relationship between trade
273 openness and growth, international trade is beneficial for economic growth.
274

275 There is also a number of studies examining the impact of the telecommunication investment
276 by considering different services provided within the sector. For example, Garbade and
277 Silber [31] explore the positive impact of technologic innovations i.e. telegraph and Trans-
278 Atlantic cable on market integration in the USA between 1840 and 1975. They suggest that
279 these innovations narrowed the inter-market price differentials by enriching the flow of price
280 information and execution of the trade. Sridhar and Sridhar [32] analyse the relationship
281 between telecommunication and growth in 63 developing countries for the period 1990-2001
282 by forming simultaneous equation model and applying three-stage least squares (3SLS)
283 method. When the effects of capital and labor force are controlled, land line and mobile
284 phone penetration have significant effects on economic growth. Levendis and Lee [33] unveil
285 in their studies that an increase in the level of telephone penetration causes higher growth in
286 29 Asian economies between 1981 and 2006. Lee et al. [34] suggest that mobile phone is a
287 substantial input for growth, and impact of the sector greater where landline phones are rare
288 in their study for Sub-Saharan Africa over 1975-2006. Furthermore, OngoNkoa [35] explores
289 the effects of FDI on economic growth on the Central African Economic and Monetary
290 Community between 1980 and 2010. Unlike other studies, the writer adds interaction
291 variables to the model as well in order to identify through which channels FDI affects growth.
292 The findings of the research revealed that private investment, human capital and FDI are

293 positive and significant, trade openness is negative-significant, and labor force is positive-
294 insignificant. But the number of mobile phone subscription per a hundred people which is
295 defined as infrastructure variable came out positive but insignificant. This finding is linked to
296 low quality infrastructure and lack of adequate investment. Sahin et al. [36] contribute to the
297 existing literature on tele-density and growth nexus in the EU area. They distinguished the
298 impact of the number of telephone lines in EU 15, EU 12, and EU 27 countries over 1980-
299 2010 period. According to the findings, landline service has a positive impact in all groups for
300 three models with the exception of two models in EU 15.

301
302 Thompson and Garbacz [37] contribute to the previous literature on the direct and indirect
303 impact of broadband services. They asserted that these impacts considerably differ for US
304 state-level data over 2001-2006 period. According to the findings, direct impact is little or
305 even negative, whereas indirect impact has a substantial role in catalysing market efficiency
306 and productivity of other inputs. In their subsequent study Thompson and Garbacz [15]
307 examine the impact of telecommunication broadband penetration on economic growth in 43
308 low and high-income countries. It is found out that mobile broadband has a direct influence
309 on the GDP of all countries, but there is no impact of fixed bandwidth. When they are
310 classified according to income groups, it is discovered that low-income countries benefit
311 significantly more from mobile broadband.

312
313 Despite the substantial empirical evidence on positive impact of the sector, there are a few
314 studies that assert the existence of negative impact. One such piece of research by Faridi et
315 al. [38] unveil the negative effect of telecommunication investment analysed for Pakistan in
316 the period 1972-2010. They find causality between capital and GDP as well as
317 telecommunication and GDP. The writers employing the Solow Growth Model find capital
318 and transportation positive and significant but telecommunication negative and significant.
319 According to the writers, the misuse of telecommunication by young population could have a
320 negative impact on society. Why labor force variable found positive but insignificant was
321 linked to the fact that the majority of the labor force in Pakistan is unskilled or semiskilled.
322 Ward and Zheng [39] compare the impact of mobile telephone and fixed service on growth in
323 China between 1991 and 2010. They conclude that impact of fixed service in the later period
324 deviates from the earlier period and turns out to be negative. In alignment with this finding,
325 Seo et al. [40] establish a cumulative growth model to analyse the dynamic dependent
326 relationship between telecommunication (ICT) and economic growth in 29 countries. They
327 estimate four different equations showing that there is not any dependency between ICT
328 investments and economic growth, whereas a causality exists between non-ICT investments
329 and economic growth.

330
331 Possible nexus between regulation, privatization and growth is also examined in a number of
332 studies. For example, Li and Xu [41] analyse the impact of reforms in the sectors pertaining
333 to privatization and competition between 1990-2001 over 177 counties. They categorize
334 these counties into two groups based on whether they implement more and less aggressive
335 reforms. Results of the study indicate that countries that implement more aggressive reforms
336 increase their production as a result of improving the allocation of labor and capital. It is also
337 revealed that state-controlled sectors do not reveal any significant impact. Paleologos and
338 Polemis [10] examine 30 OECD countries between 1988 and 2010. According to the
339 findings, there is a strong and positive relationship between effective regulation and
340 investment. A regulatory environment in telecommunication sector positively affects the
341 economic growth. The better regulatory environment is, the better economy performs.
342 Another finding is that privatization of telecommunication sector has a positive and
343 significant effect on economic activities. But a comparative analysis of country groups we
344 have in our study is not included in their research. Maiorana and Stern [42] analyse the
345 nature of the relationship between regulations and the performance of mobile phone sector

346 in thirty low-income and middle-income countries for the period 1990-2004. This is one of the
347 pioneering studies employing a simultaneous equation model, and conclude that the
348 existence of regulatory institutions in developing countries has a positive influence on mobile
349 phone penetration. The better mobile phone infrastructure is, the more it will contribute to
350 GDP per capita.

351

352 **3. METHODOLOGY**

353

354 **3.1. Dynamic Panel Data Models**

355

356 Unlike static panel data models, dynamic panel data models contain lagged values of
357 variables [43]. Cross-sectional data set alone cannot be used to estimate dynamic effects
358 since dynamism literally asks for time dimension. As such, single time series data set is
359 insufficient in the estimation of dynamic coefficients [44]. Both micro and macro dynamic
360 effects are usually estimated in dynamic panel data framework. While forming the
361 expectations, the policymakers are assumed to base their experiences on not only the past,
362 although they make use of their existing information sets [45]. Expectations are adapted in a
363 certain ratio of the difference between the value of the variable at that period and the
364 previous one [46]. In this research model, the GDP expectations of policymakers are
365 assumed to be on the ratio of the difference between the GDP at every period and its
366 expectation formed in the previous period. Combining these principles to formulate the
367 dynamic panel data models:

368

$$369 Y_{it} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 X_{it} + \gamma_2 Y_{i,t-1} + v_{it}, i = 1, 2, \dots N, t = 1, 2, \dots T \quad (1)$$

370

371 where v_{it} is the error term and since i is fixed for the unit during the entire time both Y_{it} and
372 $Y_{i,t-1}$ have impact on the error term. X_{it} is the independent variable. Since $Y_{i,t-1}$ appears as a
373 regressor on the right-hand side of the regression equation, it is correlated with v_{it} [47]. That
374 is why the Least Squares is not the correct method of estimation since its variance is not
375 unbiased [48]. In our research model, autoregressive dynamic panel structure is formed with
376 the lagged values of the GDP as an independent variable. Arellano and Bover [49] and
377 Blundell and Bond [50] made use of System Generalized Moments in Dynamic Panel Data
378 analysis.

379

380 **4. ANALYSES OF DATA**

381

382 **4.1. Description of the Data**

383

384 Our data set includes observations from 31 countries 17 of which are members of the EU,
385 and 14 are not. The EU members are Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland,
386 France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Holland, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia,
387 Slovenia and England (though England is in process of exiting from the EU, data set we use
388 covers the range where England is part of the EU) whereas the others are Australia, Brazil,
389 Canada, Chile, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa,
390 Switzerland and Turkey.

391

392 Data retrieved from World Bank Development Indicators were analyzed by STATA 13.2.
393 The primary goal of our investigation is to figure out factors affecting growth in the stated
394 countries over 1993-2013 with special emphasis on telecommunication regulations.

395

396 We focus on the followings research hypotheses:

H_{01} : Telecommunication regulations have no significant impact on economic growth.

397 H₀₂: Compared to other OECD countries, telecommunication regulations in EU members
 398 have no significant impact on economic growth.

399

400 Dynamic panel data model we establish to estimate is:

401

$$Y_{it} = b_0 + b_1X_{it} + dY_{i,t-1} + v_{it}, i = 1, 2, \dots N, t = 1, 2, \dots T \quad (2)$$

402

403 The dependent variable in the model is (GDP_{it}) with 2005 fixed prices. GDP is a proxy
 404 variable representing economic growth. In literature most studies show economic growth as
 405 the income per person; however, some studies used current income or real income. For
 406 instance, Faridi et al. [38] used GDP with current prices, OngoNkoa [35], Kumar et al. [26],
 407 and Shiu and Lam [27] use real GDP). Independent variables are collectively shown as X_{it};
 408 gross capital formation with 2005 fixed prices (Capital), total labor force (Labor), share of
 409 foreign direct investment entry in GDP (FDI), share of foreign openness in GDP to account
 410 for how countries integrate with the foreign world (Trade Openness), and telecommunication
 411 infrastructure index (TII). In addition to them, we have a dummy variable (D1) and an
 412 interaction variable (D1*TII) in the analysis. D1 differentiates the country type: European
 413 Union or not. D1*TII is the interaction dummy to represent the telecommunication
 414 infrastructure index based on country type. The characteristics of the data series used in the
 415 analysis for EU Member Countries are presented in Table 2.

416

417

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of European Union Member Countries

Variable		Mean	St. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Country	All	15.529	8.379	2	31
	Between		8.625	2	31
	In		0	15.529	15.529
Years	All	2003	6.064	1993	2013
	Between		0	2003	2003
	In		6.064	1993	2013
GDP	All	26.129	1.643	22	28.782
	Between		1.681	23.099	28.667
	In		0.182	25.030	26.567
Capital	All	24.630	1.581	20.931	27.169
	Between		1.606	21.772	27.079
	In		0.254	23.709	25.407
Labor force	All	15.415	1.419	11.909	17.564
	Between		1.460	12.046	17.528
	In		0.044	15.269	15.524
Trade Openness	All	4.376	0.388	3.586	5.201
	Between		0.355	3.879	4.899
	In		0.178	3.579	4.732
FDI	All	2.591	0.368	0	4.586
	Between		0.181	2.375	3.122
	In		0.323	-0.136	4.055
TII	All	1.130	0.720	-1.238	1.893
	Between		0.265	0.588	1.498
	In		0.672	-0.695	2.201

418

Source: Author's computation.

419

Note: Sampling size (N)= 357, Number of Countries (n) = 17 and Time (in year, T) = 21

420
421
422
423
424
425
426

We made use of “telephone ground lines (user/1000 people), mobile phones (subscriber/1000 people) and internet users (subscriber/1000 people)” to identify the TII. It is derived with the help of the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) over the combination of three series defined above following many panel data studies exemplified by researchers [51, 52, 53, 54]. PCA consists of many steps since it is explanatory [55, 56]. Factor load is computed using factor analysis. TII is computed with the factor loads of:

$$TII = \sum_{i=1}^3 a_{ij} \frac{x_{ij}}{sd(x_{ij})} \quad (3)$$

427
428
429
430
431
432
433

where a_{ij} are the factor loads, and $sd(x_{ij})$ are the standard deviations of x_{ij} . We compute the TII belonging to each country with this formulation. The characteristics of the data series used in the analysis for Non-EU Member Countries are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Non-European Union Countries

Variable		Mean	St. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Country	All	16.571	9.583	1	30
	Between		9.928	1	30
	In		0	16.571	16.571
Years	All	2003	6.066	1993	2013
	Between		0	2003	2003
	In		6.066	1993	2013
GDP	All	26.568	1.322	23.058	29.196
	Between		1.352	23.419	29.117
	In		0.208	26.007	26.982
Capital	All	25.0380	1.401	21.258	27.801
	Between		1.411	21.772	27.656
	In		0.326	23.081	25.807
Labor force	All	15.956	1.575	11.901	18.403
	Between		1.588	12.046	18.018
	In		0.360	13.898	16.923
Trade Openness	All	4.034	0.449	2.746	5.101
	Between		0.360	3.164	4.586
	In		0.285	3.129	5.484
FDI	All	2.516	0.281	-0.225	3.842
	Between		0.112	2.316	2.797
	In		0.260	-0.290	3.777
TII	All	0.941	0.886	-1.715	1.914
	Between		0.540	0.017	1.498
	In		0.716	-1.022	2.452

434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441

Source: Author's computation

Note: Sampling size (N)= 294, Number of countries (n)= 14 and Time (for year, T) = 21.

In our Dynamic Panel data-modeling GDP_{it} is the dependent variable (Y_{it}); Capital, Labor, Trade Openness, FDI and TII are independent variables (X_{it}). We regress GDP_{it} on its lagged value, GDP_{it-1} , as if the lagged value is an independent variable in our Dynamic Panel Data Analysis. Apart from being an independent variable, another contribution of lagged GDP to the model is that it provides testing of autoregressive attitude of dependent variable for short term [28]. Descriptive statistics of EU and non-EU countries are illustrated in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. All results reported are in line with

442 expectations. In order to obtain proper results in regression analysis, a series of variables used in
 443 models must be stationary, the lack of which may cause spurious regression. Hence, we report the
 444 results of the Levin, Lin&Chu test.

445

446 4.2 Unit Root test

447

448 Owing to the fact that only Labor has the p-value greater than 5% among the variables
 449 employed in the model formed for other Non-European Union OECD Countries as illustrated
 450 in Table 4, our model has all its variables stationary when Labor s differenced (The unit root
 451 test result for the first difference is displayed in brackets).

452

453

Table 4. Unit Root Test Results for Non-European Union OECD Countries

Variable	Levin, Lin &Chu t	p-value
GDP	-4.3248	0.0000
Capital	-3.9743	0.0000
Labor	0.8172(-4.8162)	0.7931(0.0000)*
Trade Openness	-2.3229	0.0101
FDI	-5.2528	0.0000
TII	-8.4505	0.0000

Source: Author's computation

, Note: (*) First lagged value is in the brackets.

454

455

456

457 All series belonging to the EU countries are stationary at their levels, as portrayed by Table
 458 5.

459

460

Table 5. Unit Root Test Results for European Union OECD Countries

Variable	Levin, Lin &Chu t	p-value
GDP	-7.7743	0.0000
Capital	-6.9780	0.0000
Labor	-7.0205	0.0000
Trade Openness	-7.7310	0.0000
FDI	-6.5476	0.0000
TII	-8.0872	0.0000

Source: Author's computation

461

462

463

464

463 4.3 Estimation Results

465 We present the estimation results of the model by Arellano and Bover/ Blundell and Bond's
 466 Method of System Generalized Moments in Table 6.

467

468

469

Table 6. Estimation Results for EU and non-EU Countries

European Union Countries and Non-European Union (other OECD) Countries				
Variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	z	p
GDP	0.2973	0.0962	3.09	0.002
Capital	0.1799	0.0372	4.84	0.000
Labor	0.3218	0.0250	12.87	0.000
Trade Openness	0.1675	0.0248	6.74	0.000

470

FDI	-0.0188	0.0080	-2.35	0.019
TII	0.0839	0.0207	4.05	0.000
D1	0.0614	0.0361	1.70	0.089
D1*TII	-0.0387	0.0223	1.73	0.083

471
472
473

Source: Author's computation
Note: Model was formed taking logarithms of all variables.

474
475

4.4 Adequacy of the Model

476
477
478
479
480

Three basic tests were applied in order to check the adequacy of Dynamic Panel Data assumptions before the model is estimated. Results of Wald, Hensen and Arellano-Bond (AB) tests are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Dynamic Panel Data Assumptions Check

European Union Countries and Non-European Union (other OECD) Countries		
Test	Statistics	p
Wald chi2(8)	1490.87	0.000
Hensen- chi2(203)	29.65	1.000
AR(1)	-1.18	0.240
AR(2)	1.37	0.170

481
482

Source: Author's computation

483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492

We made use of the Wald Test to check whether the set of independent variables is sufficient to account for explaining the dependent variable, growth. The null, H_0 of insufficiency is rejected according to both model ($p < 0.05$) results. We conclude that independent variables have the power of describing the dependent variable. In addition, we employ the Hensen test to check for whether the instrumental variables are external or not and conclude that independent variables and error term are not correlated. In addition, according to Table 7, auto correlation test is executed by Arellano-Bond (AB) test. Due to the fact that second degree correlation (AR(2)) has $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ in both the models, null hypothesis of "No Autocorrelation" is not rejected.

493
494

5. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509

Based on our estimation results, there is a positive relation between Capital and GDP the coefficient of which reveals that one percent increases in capital causes approximately 0.18% increase in GDP. Similarly, Labor and Trade Openness are positively associated with GDP. One percent increase emerging at Trade Openness means 0.17% increase in GDP, and one percent increase in Labor leads to a 0.32% increase in GDP. In line with Capital, Labor and Trade Openness, the impact of Telecom Privatization on GDP is also positive; one percent increase in TII means 0.08% increase in GDP. The lagged GDP, as expected indicates an increase in GDP. In all countries, one percent increase in the GDP of the previous year increases the GDP of the present year by 0.3%. On the other hand, FDI is negatively oriented with GDP. One percent increase in FDI due to this inverse relationship reduces 0.019% from GDP. Negative impact of the FDI on GDP is set forth in other studies [57, 58]. We elaborate on this in the conclusion section more. Finally, D1 shows that there is a significant difference between European Union and non-European Union countries.

510 **6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

511 It was observed that when European Union member countries and some OECD countries
512 outside European Union were compared in terms of the factors affecting the gross domestic
513 product, the same independent variables are effective at both country groups. While it was
514 found out that the GDP for all countries in the study is affected by factors of capital, labor,
515 trade openness and Telecom infrastructure in a positive way, the GDP of two country groups
516 is affected by foreign direct investment in negative way. Furthermore, lagged GDP variables
517 employed in dynamic panel data modeling contributed positively to the model in both country
518 groups. Capital factor in all countries contributes to the GDP positively. Considering the fact
519 that production efficiency is maintained by capital accumulation, the results are incoherent
520 with theory.

521 Unlike many studies conducted in the literature, foreign direct investment's impact on growth
522 is negative. This situation shows that European Union bears the effects of 2008 crisis. The
523 fact that investment increases for countries contribute to economic growth negatively
524 illustrates that the integrated structure of markets still tries to recover from the crisis.
525 Cardoso and Dornbusch [59] summarize the traditional analysis of FDI in trade models. If
526 capital is paid at its marginal product, a discrete inflow of capital increases national income,
527 as the increase in output is larger than the returns to foreign capital. If some distortion
528 implies that capital is paid more than its marginal product, foreign investment may imply a
529 decrease in welfare. The intensity of the number of developing countries in the group lays
530 the ground for trade openness to form meaningful impact on GDP. Lagged GDP impacts
531 GDP positively in both European Union and other country group, a situation that indicates
532 how economic growth is correlated with motivation. The series of the previous year shapes
533 the growth of the present year.

534 In analyzing the impact of telecommunication on GDP, it is seen that it contributes to
535 economic growth meaningfully for both country groups. This effect is more observed in
536 European Union countries than other OECD countries. While there is no limitation on foreign
537 investors in developing telecommunication in European Union countries, the condition is
538 different in other country groups. In non-EU OECD countries, there are limitations on
539 telecom depending on the country. For instance, one of the striking limitations is the
540 maximum limit of 49 % foreign share in ownership. In other words, these countries do not
541 wish to renounce their right to sovereignty. On the other hand, there are binding decisions
542 that European Union countries have taken at market integration. Hence, European Union
543 countries formed a common market structure in the sector of developing communication
544 technologies. Formation of a common market in telecom reflects the prices of end-user and
545 paves the way for users to approach Internet easily. Especially more widespread Internet
546 lowers cost of operation considerably. As a consequence, the market that is limited to
547 European Union turns into a market whose boundaries are designated by the access points
548 of the internet.

549 Parallel to the findings by [27], there is a connection between real GDP and the development
550 of telecommunication in countries where the welfare level is high, similar to the findings of
551 this study concluding that the telecommunication infrastructure's effect on GDP is higher in
552 EU countries than the other OECD countries. Yildiz [29] studied OECD countries by using
553 the fixed effect model and found a positive relation between telecommunication investment
554 and GDP. Akin to Yildiz (2012), in this study, despite having the same results, the dynamic
555 panel model is used on EU and non-EU OECD countries.

556 The difference between our and Roller and Waverman [18] studies is that we used lagged
557 GDP variables in dynamic panel data modeling compared EU and other non-EU OECD
558 countries and the time period we have is more recent, while they did not use this method,
559 compared OECD and OECD non-member countries, and did their research without including
560 recent technological developments due to their time range. Our research findings are

561 significant in that it examines the relationship between such important infrastructure as
562 telecommunication and economic growth comparatively for European Union and non-
563 European Union OECD countries.

564 The effects of progress in infrastructure on the economy are positive over the channels of
565 employment creation, foreign capital inflow, and increase in productivity. Although positive
566 results are focused on more, the results may be different due to the presence of
567 bureaucracy, problems in administrations and economic or political crisis. In European
568 Union, where obstacles in telecommunication sectors have almost been removed,
569 improvements in telecommunication infrastructure have more impact on growth.

570
571 Since telecom appears as the key sector to fuel growth because it is associated with
572 information technology and all ramifications of computer based applications and mobile
573 communication, all countries at all development levels are proposed to focus on investing in
574 these sectors the opposite of which hinders growth.

575
576 Studies to follow may comparatively examine different sectors, where limitations are
577 removed or minimized, on growth. Furthermore, various studies could be conducted with
578 simultaneous analysis of the related sector in terms of supplies and demand, indications of
579 economic/political crisis, by the participation of foreign direct investment and labor to the
580 model.

581

582

583

584 REFERENCES

585

586 1. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development -UNCTAD. World
587 Investment Report 2015. Accessed 11 January 2016. Available:
588 http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2015_en.pdf.

589 2. Herzer D. How Does Foreign Direct Investment Really Affect Developing Countries'
590 Growth?. *Review of International Economics*. 2012; 20(2):396-414.

591 3. Mencinger J. Does Foreign Direct Investment Always Enhance Economic Growth?
592 *Kyklos, International Review of Social Sciences*. 2003; 56(4):491-508.

593 4. Alfaro L. Foreign Direct Investment and Growth, Does the Sector Matter? 2003.
594 Accessed 02 January 2016. Available: <http://www.people.hbs.edu/lalfaro/fdisectorial.pdf>.

595 5. Lyroudi K, Papanastasiou J, Athanasios V. Foreign Direct Investment and Economic
596 Growth in Transition Economies. *South Eastern Journal of Economics*. 2004; 1:97-110.

597 6. Rao S, Zhang Q. Macro-Economic Effects of Inward and Outward FDI in Canada,
598 *Transnational Corporations Review*. 2019;11(1): 80-96, DOI:
599 10.1080/19186444.2019.1579596.

600 7. Gholami R, Sang-Yong TL, Heshmati A. The Causal Relationship between ICT and FDI.
601 *Unites Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics Research*. 2005.
602 *Research Paper No. 2005/26*.

603 8. Alraja MN, Hammami S, Al Samman HM. Investment in Information and Communication
604 Technology in Developing Countries: The Effect of Foreign Direct Investment: Evidences
605 from Sultanate of Oman, *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*.
606 2016;6(4):1632-1636.

607 9. Wallsten SJ. Privatizing Monopolies in Developing Countries: The Real Effects of
608 Exclusivity Periods in Telecommunications, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*.
609 2004;26(3):303-320.

610 10. Paleologos JM, Polemis M. What drives investment in the Telecommunications Sector?
611 *Some Lessons from the OECD Countries. Economic Modelling*. 2013 31; 49-57.

- 612 11. The Insight Research Cooperation. Worldwide Telecommunications Industry Revenue
613 to Reach \$2.4 Trillion in 2020, says Insight Research Corp. 2015; Accessed 13 December
614 2015. Available: http://www.insight-corp.com/pr/2_12_15.asp.
- 615 12. International Telecommunication Union. ICT Facts And Figures 2017. 2017. Accessed
616 03 July 2019. Available: [https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-](https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/facts/ICTFactsFigures2017.pdf)
617 [D/Statistics/Documents/facts/ICTFactsFigures2017.pdf](https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/facts/ICTFactsFigures2017.pdf).
- 618 13. Fundanga CM, Mwaba A. Privatization of Public Enterprises in Zambia: An Evaluation of
619 Policies Procedures and Experiences. African Development Bank Economic Research
620 Paper. 1997. No. 35. Accessed 19 October 2015. Available:
621 [http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/00157604-EN-ERP-](http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/00157604-EN-ERP-35.PDF)
622 [35.PDF](http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/00157604-EN-ERP-35.PDF).
- 623 14. Leff NH. Externalities, Information Costs, and Social Benefit-Cost Analysis for Economic
624 Development: An Example from Telecommunications. *Economic Development and Cultural*
625 *Change*. 1984;32(2):255-276.
- 626 15. Thompson HG Jr, Garbacz C. Broadband impacts on state GDP: direct and indirect
627 impacts. Paper presented at the International Telecommunications Society 17th Biennial
628 Conference, Canada. 2011. Accessed 02 July 2019. Available:
629 <http://www.imaginar.org/taller/its2008/62.pdf>.
- 630 16. Eggleston K, Jensen R, Zeckhauser R. Information and Communication Technologies,
631 Markets and Economic Development. Department of Economics Working Paper. Tufts
632 University. 2002. Accessed 29 July 2016. Available:
633 <http://ase.tufts.edu/economics/papers/200203.pdf>.
- 634 17. Jensen R. The Digital Divide: Information (Technology), Market Performance, And
635 Welfare In The South Indian Fisheries Sector. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 2007;
636 CXXII: 879-924.
- 637 18. Roller LH, Waverman L. Telecommunications Infrastructure and Economic
638 Development: A Simultaneous Approach. *American Economic Review*. 2001;91(4): 909-923.
- 639 19. Jipp A. Wealth of Nations and Telephone Density. *Telecommunications Journal*.
640 1963;199-201.
- 641 20. Hardy, AP. The Role of the Telephone in Economic Development. *Telecommunications*
642 *Policy*. 1980; 4(4): 278-286.
- 643 21. Dvornik D, Sabolić D. Telecommunication Liberalization and Economic Development in
644 European Countries in Transition. *Technology in Society*. 2007;29(4): 378–387.
- 645 22. Wolde-Rufael Y. Another Look at the Relationship Between Telecommunications
646 Investment and Economic Activity in the United States. *International Economic Journal*.
647 2007;21(2):199–205.
- 648 23. Pradhan RP, Arvin MB, Norman NR, Bele SK. Economic Growth and the Development
649 of Telecommunications Infrastructure in the G-20 Countries: A Panel-VAR Approach.
650 *Telecommunications Policy*. 2014;38(7):634-649.
- 651 24. Dutta A. Telecommunications and Economic Activity: An Analysis of Granger Causality.
652 *Journal of Management Information Systems*. 2001;17(4):71-95.
653 DOI:10.1080/07421222.2001.11045658.
- 654 25. Chakraborty C, Nandi B. Privatization, telecommunications and growth in selected Asian
655 countries: An econometric analysis. *Communications and Strategies*. 2003;52:31-47.
- 656 26. Kumar RR, Radika DK, Patel A. Accounting for Telecommunications Contribution to
657 Economic Growth, *Telecommunications Policy*. 2015;39(3):284-295.
- 658 27. Shiu Alice, Lam PL. Casual Relationship Between Telecommunications and Economic
659 Growth in China and its Regions, *Regional Studies*. 2008;42(5):705-718.
- 660 28. Datta A, Agarwal, S. Telecommunications and Economic Growth: A Panel Data
661 Approach. *Applied Economics*. 2004;36(15):1649-1654.
- 662 29. Yildiz F. Telekomünikasyon Yatırımlarının Ekonomik Büyüme Üzerindeki Etkisi: OECD
663 Ülkeleri Üzerine Ampirik Bir Çalışma. *Suleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler*
664 *Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2012;17(3): 233-258.

- 665 30. Batuo ME. The Role of Telecommunications Infrastructure in the Regional Economic
666 Growth of Africa. *The Journal of Developing Areas*. 2015;49(1): 313-330.
- 667 31. Garbade KD, Silber WL. Technology, Communication and the Performance of Financial
668 Markets: 1840-1975. *The Journal of Finance*. 1978;33(3):819-832.
- 669 32. Sridhar KS, Sridhar V. Telecommunications Infrastructure and Economic Growth:
670 Evidence from Developing Countries. *Applied Econometrics and International Development*.
671 2007;7(2):37-61.
- 672 33. Levendis John, Lee SH. On the Endogeneity of Telecommunications and Economic
673 Growth: Evidence from Asia. *Information Technology for Development*. 2013; 19(1): 62–85.
674 Accessed 15 March 2019. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2012.694793>.
- 675 34. Lee SH, Levendis J, Gutierrez L. Telecommunications and Economic Growth: an
676 Empirical Analysis of Sub-Saharan Africa. *Applied Economics*. 2012;44: 461–469.
- 677 35. Bruno ONE. Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth: The Experience of
678 CEMAC Countries. *Journal of Finance & Economics*. 2014; 2(1): 1-14.
- 679 36. Sahin O, Can N, Demirbas, E. The Effects of Infrastructure Determinants on Economic
680 Growth: European Union Sample. *Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics*.
681 2014;7(13):11-27.
- 682 37. Thompson HGJr, Garbacz C. Economic Impacts of Mobile Versus Fixed Broadband.
683 *Telecommunications Policy*. 2011;35(11):999-1009.
- 684 38. Faridi MZ, Malik MS, Bashir F. Transportation, Telecommunication and Economic
685 Development in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*. 2011;1(7):45-
686 52.
- 687 39. Ward MR, Zheng S. Mobile Telecommunications Service and Economic Growth:
688 Evidence from China. *Telecommunications Policy*. 2014;40:89-101.
- 689 40. Seo, HJ, Lee YS, Oh, JH. Does ICT Investment Widen the Growth Gap?.
690 *Telecommunications Policy*. 2009;33(8):422-431.
- 691 41. Li W, Xu LC. The Impact of Privatization and Competition in the Telecommunications
692 Sector around the World. *The Journal of Law & Economics*. 2004;47(2):395-430.
- 693 42. Maiorano F, Stern J. Institutions and Telecommunications Infrastructure in Low and
694 Middle-Income Countries: The Case of Mobile Telephony. Joint Center. AEl-Brookings Joint
695 Center for Regulatory Studies. 2007; Accessed 23 October 2018. Available:
696 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6716733.pdf>.
- 697 43. Yerdelen Tatoglu F. Ileri Panel Veri Analizi. (1. Baskı). Istanbul: Beta Basım Yayım
698 Dagitim; 2012.
- 699 44. Hsiao C. *Analysis of Panel Data*. 2nd ed. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press;
700 2003.
- 701 45. Shaw, GK. *Rational Expectations: An Elementary Exposition*. New York: St. Martin's
702 Press; 1984.
- 703 46. Gujarati DN, Porter, DC. *Basic Econometrics*. 5th ed: Singapore. McGraw Hill; 2009
- 704 47. Baltagi B. *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*. 3rd ed: Great Britain. John Wiley & Sons
705 Inc; 2005.
- 706 48. Zeren F, Ergun S. AB'ye Dogrudan Yabancı Yatırım Girişlerini Belirleyen Faktorler:
707 Dinamik Panel Veri Analizi, *İsletme ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 2010;1(4):67-83.
- 708 49. Arellano M, Bover O. Another Look at the Instrumental Variables Estimation of Error
709 Component Models. *Journal of Econometrics*. 1995;68(1): 29-51.
- 710 50. Blundell R, Bond, S. Initial Conditions and Moment Restrictions in Dynamic Panel Data
711 Models. *Journal of Econometrics*. 1998;87(1):115-143.
- 712 51. Saci K, Holden K. Evidence on Growth and Financial Development Using Principal
713 Components. *Applied Financial Economics*. 2008;18(19):1549-1560.
- 714 52. Huang Y. *Determinants of Financial Development*. Palgrave MacMillan. New York; 2010.
- 715 53. World Economic Forum. *The Financial Development Report*. 2011. World Economic
716 Forum USA, Inc., New York.

- 717 54. Coban S, Topcu M. The Nexus Between Financial Development and Energy
718 Consumption in the EU: A Dynamic Panel Data Analysis. *Energy Economics*. 2013;39:81-
719 88.
- 720 55. Hosseini HM, Kaneko S. Dynamics Sustainability Assessments of Countries at Macro
721 Level: A Principal Component Analysis. *Ecological Indicators*. 2011;11(3):811-823.
- 722 56. Hosseini HM, Kaneko S. Causality Between Pillars of Sustainable Development: Global
723 Stylized Facts or Regional Phenomena. *Ecological Indicators*. 2012;14(1):197-201.
- 724 57. Green K. Foreign Direct Investment in the Indian Telecommunications Sector. MPRA
725 (Munich PersonalRePec Archive), Paper No. 18099. 2005. Accessed 10 November 2018.
726 Available: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/18099/1/MPRA_paper_18099.pdf.
- 727 58. Reis AB. On the Welfare Effects of Foreign Investment. *Journal of International*
728 *Economics*. 2001; 54(2): 411-427.
- 729 59. Cardoso E, Dornbusch R. Foreign Private Capital Flows. *Handbook of Development*
730 *Economics*. 1989;2:1387-1439. Accessed 21 June 2018. Available:
731 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471\(89\)02013-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471(89)02013-9).
- 732 60. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-OECD. OECD
733 Communications Outlook. 2013; Accessed 28 December 2015. Available:
734 <http://www.oecd.org/sti/broadband/2-5.pdf>.
- 735 61. ICT Regulation Toolkit. 2005; Accessed 28 December 2015. Available:
736 <http://www.ictregulationtoolkit.org/en/toolkit/notes/PracticeNote/2551>.
- 737 62. Pretorius D. Telecommunications Regulation. South Africa: Lex Mundi Publication; 2010.
- 738 63. International Telecommunication Union. 2017 Global ICT Developments. Accessed 03
739 July 2019. Available: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/facts/default.aspx>.