Relationship Between Oil Revenues and Gross Domestic Product of Oman: An Empirical Investigation
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ABSTRACT

Oil revenues are a significant contributor to Oman’s total revenues. This study empirically examines the long run and short run causal relationship between oil revenues, real gross domestic product (GDP) and Real GDP from petroleum activities of Oman from 1985 to 2017. The Johansen Cointegration test and vector error correction (VEC) Model are used to investigate the cointegrating, long run, and short run relationship. Direction of short run causality is examined through the Wald coefficient restriction test, VEC Granger/Block Exogeneity Test and pairwise Granger causality test. Results show that a statistically significant long run relationship exists between oil revenues, GDP and GDP from petroleum activities. In the short run, however, a weak significant relation exists between GDP and real oil revenues. Variance Decomposition of Forecast error of GDP shows that 48% of variation in GDP can be explained by oil revenues. Through Impulse Responses Function results, it is concluded that initially there is a sharp rise in oil revenues after which oil revenues tend to fall.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Sultanate of Oman is a booming economy in the Middle East and enjoys stable political, economic and social system. Commercial production of oil started in 1967 and ever since oil revenues have been a significant and major contributor to total revenue. Government revenues depend upon global oil prices, global demand for oil, oil reserves and oil production capacity. Oil revenues have facilitated major advancements in social and economic development including the establishment of modern infrastructure. However, reliance on oil revenues poses serious threats.

This study proposes to examine the long run equilibrium, short run relationship and the direction of causality between oil revenues, gross domestic product (GDP) from the Petroleum sector and GDP of the Sultanate of Oman from 1985 to 2017. It also investigates how GDP from petroleum sector and Oil revenues react to an external shock from GDP and the extent to which innovations in GDP from oil sector and oil revenues can explain movements in GDP.

The Harrod Domar Model and the Dutch Disease model can explain the relationship between oil revenues and GDP. The following section briefly presents the theoretical underpinnings of the study.

2. THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF THE STUDY

The Harrod Domar Model postulates the importance of investment and capital formation in maintenance of desired growth rate. The actual growth rate in the economy is a function of capital output ratio and saving income ratio i.e. GC = S, G= ΔY/Y is the actual
rate of growth. $C = I/Y$ is the marginal capital output ratio and $S = S/Y$ is the saving income ratio.

$$\frac{\Delta Y}{Y} \frac{I}{\Delta Y} = \frac{S}{Y}$$
which implies the investment must be equal to savings.

The warranted Growth rate ($G_w$) is full employment rate of growth. $G_w = C_r/S$, where $C_r$ is the required capital output ratio. Thus, $G_w = S/C_r$. If the economy is to grow at the warranted rate than income must increase in the ratio of $S/C_r$. This rate of growth will ensure full employment. The natural growth rate $G_n$ is the maximum growth rate possible with given natural resources, population and technology. Equality between the actual growth rate, warranted growth rate and natural growth rate would ensure full employment of labor and capital.

Solow and Swan (1956) further developed the Harrod Domar model. According to the Solow and Swan model output growth is also a function of technological change. When the economy is in a steady state, technological change determines economic growth, whereas savings determine income levels.

The two-gap growth model extended the Harrod Domar analysis. According to this model, growth is constrained by domestic savings and foreign exchange reserves.

$$Y = C + I + (X - M)$$
$$Y - C = I + (X - M)$$
$$S = Y - C$$
$$M - X = I - S$$

$I - S$ is the savings gap and $M - X$ is the foreign exchange gap. Oil revenues can help in reducing both these gaps.

The three-gap model said that fiscal revenues can be another constraint in economic growth. Rent seeking activities in oil exporting countries can increase domestic savings, provide the necessary foreign exchange and fiscal revenues, thereby simultaneously relaxing all the three constraints.

Cordon and Neary (1982) put forth the Dutch disease model to explain the harmful consequences of a booming natural resource sector. According to the authors, a resource discovery and/or increase in the price of the natural resource lead to deindustrialization of the economy through the resource movement and spending effect. The consequences of a booming sector are appreciation of real exchange rate, inflation and decline of manufacturing and agricultural sector. Based on these theoretical underpinnings, the study seeks to examine the relationship between oil revenues, GDP and GDP from Petroleum sector.

### 3. REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

This section reviews studies on the relation between oil prices, oil price changes and oil revenues and GDP. Aliyu (2009) empirically examined the impact of oil price shocks on the macro economy of Nigeria using linear and non-linear models. Data from 1980 to 2007 on nominal GDP and Consumers Price Index were sourced from Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) statistical bulletin whereas data on Oil prices was obtained from the IMF website. Real GDP and oil prices were transformed into their logarithmic forms and their trends revealed strong relationship amongst them. Stationarity of the variables was checked using the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test and Phillips-Perron (PP) test. Results of the Granger causality tests block exogeneity and pair wise causality show that there is significant relationship between oil prices and real GDP. The Vector Auto regression results show that in both linear and non-linear models, oil price increases have a positive effect on the real GDP of oil exporting countries.

Ogbonna and Ebimobowei (2012) in their research paper titled “Petroleum Income and Nigerian Economy: Empirical Evidence” state that as per the Harrod (1939) and Domar (1946) growth model, the Nigerian economy is at an advantage as it can use the petroleum resources for economic growth. They however state that the Nigeria is one of the poorest countries in the world. According to the authors, the natural resource curse (Sachs and Warner, 2001) is responsible for the sustained underdevelopment of the Nigerian economy. They thus seek to find out the effects of petroleum income on the economy of Nigeria. The macro economic variables used in the study are GDP, Per Capita GDP and inflation. Data on the selected variables is collected from CBN, the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), and the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC). Using simple regression analysis, the authors inferred that the relationship of petroleum income with GDP and per capita income was statistically significant where as inflation had a negative relation.

Christian and Teymur (2014) examine the relation between oil prices, GDP and investment in Iran and GCC countries. The study is based on the neo classical growth theory, which states that long run economic growth takes place through technological progress. The international oil prices and OPEC quotas exogenously determine oil revenues. A proportion of these revenues are invested implying faster capital accumulation. A permanent effect on per capita GDP will occur in the steady state if the growth in oil revenues is above the threshold limit. Data on GDP, investment, population and inflation from 1980 to 2012 is sourced from the IMF World Economic Outlook, Central Bank of Iran and Penn world tables. Oil revenues are converted into domestic currencies using the nominal exchange rates and then deflated using the CPI. The GDP deflator is used to convert nominal to real variables. Results show that co integration exists between oil prices, GDP and investment.

Mehrara (2014) investigated the relation between non-oil trade, GDP and oil revenues in eleven selected oil-exporting countries. Panel data from 1970 to 2011 is obtained from the World Bank Development indicators. Results of the panel co integration test, Granger causality test state that there is long run causality from oil revenues and GDP to non-oil trade.

Nagmi and Aimer (2016) examined the impact of oil price changes on the economic growth of Libya from 2000 to 2015 using Johansen co-integration test, impulse response function, and
The study examines the relationship between real oil revenues, Real GDP from Petroleum Activities (henceforth referred to as GDP Oil) and Real GDP of Oman from 1985 to 2017. Real GDP is defined as the gross value of final goods and services produced in Sultanate of Oman during the year at 2010 prices. The National Centre for Statistics and information classifies GDP into the petroleum and non-petroleum sector. Real GDP from petroleum activities can be defined as the gross value of petroleum products produced during the year at 2010 prices. Real Oil Revenues are income generated through domestic and international sale of petroleum products at 2010 prices. All the variables are measured in Omani Rials.

Data on nominal oil revenues and GDP is collected from the various editions of Statistical Yearbook, Ministry of National Economy, Sultanate of Oman. The GDP deflator, with base year 2010, is used to convert oil revenues at current prices to real oil revenues. The study uses splicing technique to convert real GDP and real GDP from petroleum activity series with base years 1998 and 2010 to the base year 2010. The time series data from 1985 to 2017 is transformed to its logarithmic form.

Vohra (2017) studied the relation between oil prices, economic growth, budget deficit and current account balance of GCC countries from 2000 to 2015. Pearsons correlation was used to test the empirical model $c_{ai} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \Delta y_i + \beta_2 \Delta p_i + e$. Country wise analysis revealed a weak positive relation between current account balance as percentage of GDP and economic growth for Oman where as it was moderate for oil price changes. According to the study, low oil prices have caused budget deficits and potential for instability.

Al Rasasi et al. (2018) empirically examine the relation between oil revenues and economic growth of Saudi Arabia from 1970 to 2017. ADF test, PP test were used to check the stationary properties of the variables. Through the results Johansen and Juselius co integration test, the authors conclude that there is a long run relationship between real oil revenues and output. The OLS regression coefficients highlight the important role played by oil revenues. A 10% increase in Saudi Arabia’s oil revenue caused a six point five rise in non-oil output. Oil revenues were transmitted into the economy through government spending.

Based on theoretical and empirical literature, the current study seeks to examine the empirical relationship between real GDP, real GDP from petroleum activities and real oil revenues. The following section discusses the econometric methodology employed in the study.

### 4. DATA AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study examines the relationship between real oil revenues, Real GDP from Petroleum Activities (henceforth referred to as GDP Oil) and Real GDP of Oman from 1985 to 2017. Real GDP is defined as the gross value of final goods and services produced in Sultanate of Oman during the year at 2010 prices. The National Centre for Statistics and information classifies GDP into the petroleum and non-petroleum sector. Real GDP from petroleum activities can be defined as the gross value of petroleum products produced during the year at 2010 prices. Real Oil Revenues are income generated through domestic and international sale of petroleum products at 2010 prices. All the variables are measured in Omani Rials.

Data on nominal oil revenues and GDP is collected from the various editions of Statistical Yearbook, Ministry of National Economy, Sultanate of Oman. The GDP deflator, with base year 2010, is used to convert oil revenues at current prices to real oil revenues. The study uses splicing technique to convert real GDP and real GDP from petroleum activity series with base years 1998 and 2010 to the base year 2010. The time series data from 1985 to 2017 is transformed to its logarithmic form.

The ADF test and PP test are used to test the Stationary properties of the variables. All the variables were stationary at their first difference. After determining the optimal lag length, the co integration properties of the variables are tested using the Johansen co integration test. Since the Johansen cointegration test resulted in one co integrating relation, the long run and short run dynamics of the relation between oil revenues and GDP was tested using vector error correction model (VECM). Direction of causality between oil revenues, GDP and GDP Oil was tested using the t-statistic of the repressors, Wald Coefficient test, and Wald block exogeneity test. Unidirectional and bidirectional causality was tested using pair wise Granger Causality test. Each of these tests check the robustness and confirm the other test. Impulse Response function was used to find the impact of innovations in GDP Oil and Oil revenues on GDP. Variance decomposition of forecast error was used to investigate the impact of shocks arising from other variables. Diagnostic tests for serial auto correlation, normality and heteroscedasticity are performed. Finally, the stability of the model is tested through CUSUM test and CUSUM squares test. The analysis is performed using Eviews 10.

### 5. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

This section reports the findings of the study.

#### 5.1. Stationary Test

Stationary properties of the time series data of real Oil revenues, real GDP and real GDP Oil is tested using the unit root test. The hypothesis that the series is stationary is tested against the alternative that the series is non-stationary. The ADF test and the PP test are used to check the presence of unit roots. The following Table 1 displays the results of the ADF and PP test statistic.

The series are not stationary at level but at the first difference the null hypothesis, the series has unit root, is rejected. Stationarity at the first difference implies that though the variables seem to be drifting apart in the short run, convergence may occur in the long run. Econometric procedure provides two popular methods for testing the cointegration properties of the variables: The Engle Gagner and Johansen cointegration test. The current study utilizes the Johansen cointegration test as more than two variables are involved and the assumption of stationarity at first difference is satisfied.

**Table 1: Stationary status: Results of unit root tests**

| Variables      | At level |          | At first difference |          | Inference |
|----------------|----------|----------|---------------------|----------|-----------|
|                | ADF test statistic | PP test statistic | ADF test statistic | PP test statistic |           |
| Log OR         | -1.81    | -2.62    | -5.8                | -5.77    | I(1)      |
| Log GDP        | -1.7     | -2.01    | -4.05               | -4.01    | I(1)      |
| Log GDP Oil    | -2.12    | -2.42    | -3.67               | -3.7     | I(1)      |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-view 10. Log OR: Log of real oil revenues, Log GDP: Log of real GDP, Log oil: Log of real GDP from Petroleum activities. ADF: Augmented dickey fuller, PP: Phillips-Perron, GDP: Gross domestic product
5.2. Johansen Cointegration Test

Johansen cointegration test is sensitive to the selection of lag length. Lag is the time lapse which the dependent variable requires to respond to the independent variable. Selection of an optimal lag length is important as too many lags cause loss of degrees of freedom, multicollinearity, serial correlation in the error terms and misspecification errors. The current study selected lag 3 as the optimal lag length based on the Akaike Information Criteria. This test is performed either at level data or its log transformation. The current study performs the test on the log transformation of the variables. The Null hypothesis $H_0$: There are no cointegrating equations is tested against the alternative that $H_1$ is not true through the trace statistic and max eigen statistic. The following Table 2 presents the results.

Results of both, the trace statistic and max eigen statistic reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration between the variables in favor of the alternative that at most one cointegration equation is present. Thus, Real GDP, GDP Oil and Oil revenues are related in the long run and can be combined in a linear fashion. The normalized co-integrating equation coefficients are

$$\begin{align*}
\text{LogGDP} & = 1.0000 + 0.3441 \text{LogOR} - 0.056155 \text{LogGDPOil} - 0.367114 \text{GDPOil}\_{t-1} - 0.079651 \text{OR}\_{t-1} - 0.651060 \\text{LogGDPOil}\_{t-1} - 0.365480 \\text{LogOR}\_{t-1} + 0.933824 \\
\end{align*}$$

The long run cointegrating equation implies that, other things remaining the same, a 10% increase in real GDP Oil is associated with a 6.5% increase in real GDP where as a 10% increase in real oil revenues is associated with a 3.6% increase in the real GDP. Statistical significance of the coefficients of the error correction terms of real GDP, real oil revenues and real GDP Oil is tested through $t$ statistic. Results are presented in the following table:

The long run causal relationship is examined through the statistical significance of the coefficients of the explanatory variables and the error correction term. From P-values given in Table 3, all the ECT coefficients are statistically significant. Thus, a causal relation between real GDP, GDP Oil and Oil Revenues exists.

The VEC equation with real GDP as the target variable is estimated as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
\Delta \text{GDP} & = -0.3394 \text{ECT}_{t-1} - 0.05816 \Delta \text{GDP}_{t-1} + 0.35625 \Delta \text{GDP}_{t-2} + 0.3441 \Delta \text{GDP Oil}_{t-1} - 0.367114 \Delta \text{GDP Oil}_{t-2} - 0.079651 \Delta \text{OR}_{t-1} - 0.651060 \Delta \text{GDPOil}_{t-1} - 0.365480 \Delta \text{OR}_{t-1} + 0.933824 \\
\end{align*}$$

From the coefficient of the error correction term we can infer that previous years deviations in GDP Oil and oil revenues from the long run equilibrium are corrected in the current period at an adjustment speed of 34% and is statistically significant at $P = 0.00$. The statistical significance of the coefficients of VEC equation are presented in the following Table 4.

The second lag of GDP Oil is statistically significant at $P = 0.05$ and the first lag of oil revenue is significant at 10% level.

5.3. VEC Analysis

To understand the long run convergence of Oil Revenues, GDP and GDP Oil, the VECM is used. VECM restricts the behavior of the variables to converge to their integrating relationship while allowing for short term adjustments. This restriction results in the loss of degree of freedom, so VECM is run at P-1 that is 2 lags. All variables in the VECM model are endogenous and the target variable real GDP is entered first in the VECM system.

The error correction term signifies the speed at which the variables will converge in the long run by gradually correcting a series of deviations in oil output and revenues from the long term equilibrium through short term adjustments. Thus, the error correction term should be negative (lie between zero and negative one) and statistically significant to allow economic interpretation. As can be observed from Table 3, the error correction term $-0.339364$ is statistically significant at the 1% level.

The cointegrating equation for the model is:

$$\text{ECT}_{t-1} = [1.000 \text{GDP}_{t-1} - 0.6510607 \text{Log GDP Oil}_{t-1} - 0.365480 \\text{LogOR}_{t-1} + 0.933824]$$

From the coefficient of the error correction term we can infer that previous years deviations in GDP Oil and oil revenues from the long run equilibrium are corrected in the current period at an adjustment speed of 34% and is statistically significant at $P = 0.00$. The statistical significance of the coefficients of VEC equation are presented in the following Table 4.

The second lag of GDP Oil is statistically significant at $P = 0.05$ and the first lag of oil revenue is significant at 10% level.

To examine the joint significance of the coefficients of GDP Oil and oil revenues on real GDP, Wald coefficient restrictions test is used. The null hypothesis for the test is no granger causality.

There is no sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that in the short run, GDP Oil granger causes real GDP whereas at the 10% significance level, we can infer that oil revenues granger cause GDP (Table 5).

The VEC Granger/Block Exogeneity test is used to understand the short run causal relationships. The results of the test are presented in the following table:

From the probability values of the Chi-square statistic (Table 6), we can see that when Real GDP is the dependent variable, GDP Oil has no causal relationship whereas Oil revenues have a short

| Hypothesized no. of CE s | Trace statistic | 0.05 critical value | Prob. | Hypothesized no. of CE s | Max eigen Statistic | 0.05 critical value | Prob. |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|
| None*                    | 39.18569       | 29.79707            | 0.0031| None*                    | 26.09031            | 21.13162            | 0.0092|
| At most 1                | 13.09538       | 15.49471            | 0.1114| At most 1                | 12.54330            | 14.26460            | 0.0919|

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. *Denotes rejection of null hypothesis at 5% level
run causal on real GDP at the 10% significance level in the short run. The joint effect of both GDP Oil and oil revenues is significant in the short run at 10% level.

From the values of the Chi-square statistic, we can infer that real GDP, Oil revenues individually and jointly have a significant causal relationship with GDP oil (Table 7).

From the probability values of the Chi-square statistic, we can see that there is no sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis Real GDP and GDP Oil do not granger cause oil revenues (Table 8).

**Table 3: Statistical significance of VEC coefficients**

| Variables     | Coefficients | t-statistic | P-value |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------|
| ECT coefficient |              |             |         |
| Real GDP      | −0.339364*** | −3.264281   | 0.0017  |
| GDP Oil       | −0.364938*** | −2.750088   | 0.0077  |
| OIL Revenues  | 1.528265**   | 2.157371    | 0.0346  |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. ***Indicates 1% level of significance. **indicates 5% level of significance. VEC: Vector error correction, GDP: Gross domestic product

**Table 4: Statistical significance of VEC coefficients**

| Variables     | Coefficients | t-statistic | P-value |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------|
| ECT_{t−1}     | −0.3394***   | −3.264281   | 0.0036  |
| ∆GDP Oil_{t−1} | −0.0582      | −0.226701   | 0.8827  |
| ∆GDP Oil_{t−2} | 0.3563*      | 1.692010    | 0.1048  |
| ∆GDP Oil_{t−3} | 0.3441       | 1.596577    | 0.1246  |
| ∆GDP Oil_{t−4} | −0.3671***   | −2.044438   | 0.0531  |
| ∆OR_{t−1}     | −0.0797*     | −1.941858   | 0.0651  |
| ∆OR_{t−2}     | −0.0562      | −1.597210   | 0.1245  |
| Constant       | 0.0359***    | 3.907711    | 0.0008  |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. ***Indicates 1% level of significance. **indicates 5% level of significance, *indicates 10% level of significance. VEC: Vector error correction, GDP: Gross domestic product

**5.4. Direction of Causality**
The pairwise Granger causality test was used to infer the direction of causality. The test results are presented in the following Table 9.

**5.5. Variance Decomposition**
To identify the relative impact of real GDP, GDP oil and oil revenues have on real GDP, Variance Decomposition analysis is used. The variance decomposition of forecast error gives percentage unexpected variations in the real GDP, GDP oil and oil revenues which is due to shocks from other variables. Variance Decomposition for the GDP is presented in Table 10.

In the short run period, 100% of the forecast error is explained by GDP itself and GDP Oil and oil revenues are strongly exogenous, that is they have a very weak influence. As we move from period one to period ten the influence of real GDP on itself reduces and from strong endogenous effects in period one we have weak endogeneity in period 10. Influence of GDP Oil and oil revenues increases from period one to ten. The Wald coefficient test (Table 5) results also state that oil revenues granger cause real GDP and there was no sufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis that GDP Oil granger causes real GDP (Table 6). Oil revenues explain 48% of real GDP variation in the long run.

**5.6. Impulse Response Function**
Impulse Response Function was used to trace the effects of shocks from the error terms of GDP Oil and Oil Revenues on Real GDP. If the error term of GDP increases by one standard deviation, this shock will cause an increase in GDP till period 6 after which there is a decline in GDP. GDP Oil increases up till period 5 after which there is a decline. However in period 10, GDP Oil rises as a response to a one standard deviation shock from real GDP. Oil revenues increase sharply till period 6 after which there is a sharp decline (Table 11). The tabular and graphical representation of the Impulse Response Function is as follows:

**Table 5: Wald coefficient restrictions test**

| Test statistic | GDP Oil | Probability | Oil revenues | Probability |
|----------------|---------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| F-statistic    | 2.173221| 0.1376      | 2.265381     | 0.1274      |
| Chi-square     | 4.346441| 0.1138      | 4.531662*    | 0.1037      |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. *Indicates 10% level of significance. GDP: Gross domestic product

**Table 6: VEC granger/Block exogeneity test (Dependent variable Δ GDP)**

| Independent variables | Chi-square | Probability | Inference |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|
| ΔGDP oil              | 4.346441   | 0.1138      | GDP Oil does not have short run causal relationship with GDP |
| ΔOil revenues         | 4.531662*  | 0.1037      | Oil revenues have weakly significant short run causal relationship with GDP |
| Joint                 | 8.609003*  | 0.0717      | Both oil revenues and GDP Oil have weakly significant short run causal relationship with GDP |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. *Indicates 10% level of significance. VEC: Vector error correction, GDP: Gross domestic product

**Table 7: VEC granger/Block exogeneity test (Dependent variable Δ GDP oil)**

| Independent variables | Chi-square | Probability | Inference |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|
| ΔGDP                  | 6.851371** | 0.0325      | GDP has a short run causal relationship with GDP Oil at the 5% level |
| ΔOil revenues         | 6.747091** | 0.0343      | Oil revenues have a significant short run causal relationship with GDP Oil |
| Joint                 | 13.581155*** | 0.0088    | Both GDP and Oil revenues have a significant short run causal relationship with GDP Oil |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. ***Indicates 1% level of significance, **indicates 5% level of significance. VEC: Vector error correction, GDP: Gross domestic product
6. DIAGNOSTIC TESTS

Diagnostic tests were performed to check for the presence of serial auto correlation in the residuals, normality of residuals and heteroscedascity. Serial autocorrelation was tested using LM test. There is no sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is serial autocorrelation at lag h and at lags 1 to h.

Table 8: VEC granger/Block exogeneity test (Dependent variable ΔOIL Revenues)

| Independent variables | Chi-square | Probability | Inference |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|
| ΔGDP                  | 1.575606   | 0.4548      | No evidence of short run causal relationship |
| ΔGDP oil              | 1.736976   | 0.4196      | No evidence of short run causal relationship |
| Joint                 | 2.715132   | 0.6066      | No evidence of short run causal relationship |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. VEC: Vector error correction, GDP: Gross domestic product

Table 9: Pair wise granger causality test

| Null hypothesis | F-statistic | Probability | Inference |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| GDP Oil does not granger cause GDP | 0.51523 | 0.6759 | Uni directional Causality from GDP to GDP Oil |
| GDP does not granger cause GDP Oil | 3.14345** | 0.0447 | Uni directional causality from OR to GDP |
| Oil Revenues does not granger cause GDP | 2.53504* | 0.0818 | Uni directional causality from GDP Oil to GDP |
| GDP does not granger cause OR | 0.68913 | 0.5679 | No evidence of short run causal relationship |
| OR does not granger cause GDP Oil | 1.19573 | 0.0335 | No evidence of short run causal relationship |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. **Indicates 5% level of significance, *Indicates 1% level of significance. GDP: Gross domestic product

Table 10: Variance decomposition of real GDP

| Period | SE | Real GDP | GDP oil | Oil revenues |
|--------|----|----------|---------|--------------|
| 1      | 0.01 | 100.00   | 0.00    | 0.00         |
| 2      | 0.02 | 88.14    | 8.93    | 2.94         |
| 3      | 0.02 | 77.59    | 12.68   | 9.73         |
| 4      | 0.03 | 64.94    | 12.31   | 22.75        |
| 5      | 0.04 | 53.42    | 10.63   | 33.95        |
| 6      | 0.05 | 46.29    | 9.15    | 44.56        |
| 7      | 0.06 | 43.01    | 8.28    | 48.71        |
| 8      | 0.06 | 42.19    | 7.96    | 49.85        |
| 9      | 0.07 | 42.66    | 7.99    | 49.34        |
| 10     | 0.07 | 43.57    | 8.52    | 48.18        |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. Cholesky Ordering: Real GDP, GDP Oil, Oil Revenues. GDP: Gross domestic product

Table 11: Impulse response function

| Period | Real GDP | GDP oil | Oil revenues |
|--------|----------|---------|--------------|
| 1      | 0.010    | 0.000   | 0.000        |
| 2      | 0.013    | 0.005   | 0.003        |
| 3      | 0.014    | 0.007   | 0.007        |
| 4      | 0.015    | 0.007   | 0.014        |
| 5      | 0.016    | 0.007   | 0.020        |
| 6      | 0.016    | 0.007   | 0.022        |
| 7      | 0.015    | 0.007   | 0.022        |
| 8      | 0.015    | 0.006   | 0.018        |
| 9      | 0.014    | 0.006   | 0.014        |
| 10     | 0.014    | 0.006   | 0.011        |

Source: Author’s own calculation using E-views 10. Cholesky Ordering: Real GDP, GDP oil, Oil revenues. GDP: Gross domestic product

8. CONCLUSION

The Harrod Domar model, two gap and three gap model highlight the importance of savings, investment and foreign exchange earnings in economic growth. The Dutch disease model states that a booming natural resource sector can lead to deindustrialization in the long run. Empirical literature has found a statistically significant positive relation between oil prices and GDP (Aliyu, 2009; Christian and Teymur, 2014; Vohra, 2017), oil price changes and GDP (Ogbonna and Ebimobowei, 2012; Mehrara, 2014; Nagmi and Aimer, 2016) and Oil revenues and the non-oil sector (Al Rasasi et al., 2018).

Oman is an open economy with oil revenues being a significant contributor to the total revenues. Al Saqri (2010) in his doctoral thesis entitled “Petroleum Resources, Linkages
And Development: The Case Of Oman” examines the linkage between the oil sector and economic development in Oman. The primary objective of the study was to examine how the Sultanate of Oman can transform from an Oil Dependent to a non oil dependent economy by the year 2020. Masan (2016) in his thesis entitled “Oil and macroeconomic policies and performance in Oman” examined the relation between Oil revenues and macroeconomic policies in Oman. The current study seeks to bridge the gap in existing literature by examining the long run and short run relationship between oil revenues, Real GDP from Petroleum activities and Real GDP. It also investigates the direction of causality and the response to an external shock from GDP and the extent to which innovations in GDP from oil sector and oil revenues can explain movements in GDP.

The findings suggest the existence of a long run significant relation between the variables. However in the short run a weak significant relation between oil revenues and real GDP was observed. Variance Decomposition of forecast error for GDP shows that in the short run period, 100% of the forecast error is explained by GDP itself where as in the long run Oil revenues explain 48% of real GDP variation. Findings from the Impulse response function lead us to conclude that a one standard deviation increase in real GDP will cause an increase in itself in the short run whereas there is a sharp rise in oil revenues. Based on these findings, the authors suggest that Sultanate must diversify its revenues sources to attain and maintain a stable growth rate. A further study on the relationship between oil revenues and key macro-economic performance indicators such as inflation, real exchange rate and fiscal balance of Oman will contribute to the better understanding of the role oil revenues. As oil revenues are transmitted in Oman’s economy through Government expenditure, a study on the relationship between government expenditures and economic growth is desired.
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