

مجلة البحوث المالبة والتجاربة المجلد (22) - العدد الثالث - يوليو 2021



# The Effect of Digital Transformation on Egyptian Competitiveness Using the ARDL Model



Dr. Sally Mohamed Farid Mahmoud Associate Professor of Economics, Department of Politics and Economics, Faculty of African postgraduate Studies, Cairo University Tel. :(002) 01222944442 Email: sallyfarid2000@yahoo.com,

الملخص

تهدف الدراسة إلى تقييم "التحول الرقمي" في مصر وقياس تأثيره على القدرة النتافسية خلال الفترة (1996–2019) باستخدام نموذج الانحدار الذاتي الموزع (ARDL). وقد أظهرت النتائج وجود علاقة إيجابية بين متغير الأداء التتافسي والقيمة المبطأة لنفس المتغير، حيث أدى ارتفاع القيمة المبطأة للأداء التتافسي بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها 0.72 وحدة في الأداء التنافسي للعام الحالي. وقد أثرت نفقات البحث والتطوير بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التتافسي حيث أدت زيادتها بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها 14داء التنافسي حيث أدت زيادتها بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها الأداء التنافسي حيث البراءات الاختراع المسجلة بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها 0.01 وحدة في الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة المباشر بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي. علاوة على ذلك، أثر صافي الاستثمار الأجنبي المباشر بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي. حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة والمباشر بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي. علاوة على ذلك، أثر صافي الاستثمار الأجنبي المباشر بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي. حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة والماتف الختراع المسجلة بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة المباشر بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي. علاوة على ذلك، أثر صافي الاستثمار الأجنبي والماتف المباشر بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها المباشر بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها والماتف المحمول وحدة في الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها والهاتف الثابت بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته بمقدار وحدة واحدة إلى زيادة قدرها والهاتف الثابت بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادته وحدة واحدة ولى المحمول والهاتف الثابت بشكل إيجابي على الأداء التنافسي، حيث أدت زيادة وحدة واحدة في عدد مشتركي الماتف المحمول لكل 100 شخص، وأدى عدد مشتركي الخطوط الثابتة لكل 100 شخص إلى



حدوث زيادة قدرها 0.03 و 0.94 وحدة في الأداء التنافسي على التوالي. لذا فإنه لزيادة الأداء التنافسي في مصر لابد من زيادة كفاءة استخدام الموارد ورفع الإنتاجية، ويجب تحسين المستوى التكنولوجي في الإنتاج المصري.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التكنولوجيا الرقمية، الابتكار، التنافسية، نموذج ARDL.

#### Abstract

This study aimed at assessing the "digital transformation" of Egypt and measured its effect on the country's competitiveness during the period 1996-2019 using the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) model. Results showed positive relationship between the competitive performance variable (MVA) and the lag value of the same variable, as an increase in competitive performance during last year by one point led to an increase of 0.72 point in competitive performance during current year. The research and development expenditure positively affected competitive performance as one-point increase led to an increase of 0.41 point in competitive performance. The number of patents registered by individuals positively affected MVA as one-point increase led to an increase of 0.01 point in MVA. Moreover, the net foreign direct investment positively affected MVA as one-point increase led to an increase of 0.05 point in MVA, and one-point increase in the high technology exports led to an increase of 0.25 point in competitive performance. Also, the number of mobile and fixed phone lines subscribers positively affected MVA as one-point increase in the number of mobile phone subscribers per 100 people (MOB), and the number of fixed-line subscribers per 100 people (FTS) led to an increase of 0.03, 0.94 point in competitive performance, respectively. In conclusion, to achieve competitive performance in Egypt by increasing efficiency in both resources' usage and technical productivity, the technological level in Egyptian production must be improved.

**Keywords:** Digital Technology; Innovation; Competitively; ARDL Model; implications.

**Contribution/Originality:** This study contributes to the existing literature on the digital transformation and competitiveness phenomenon. The study uses new estimation methodology to fill the research gap regarding the effect of the digital transformation on competitiveness; this study is one of few that have investigated the digital transformation and competitiveness in Egypt using econometrics methodology.



# **1. Introduction**

UNIDO (2013) defined competitiveness as the ability of states to increase their presence in the international and domestic markets in conjunction with the development in sectors and activities with high-value and technological content.

Digital technology offers countries around the world a unique opportunity to accelerate socio-economic development and build a better future. Digital innovations are currently transforming almost all sectors of the economy by introducing new business models, new products, new services, and new ways of creating value and jobs. The results of this transformation are already beginning to emerge; the global digital economy is currently worth 11.5 trillion Dollars, or 15.5% of global GDP (Henry, 2018). Technology also has a profound impact on the way governments work and interact with their citizens, as it opens the door to increased transparency and efficiency in service delivery. The innovation can remove any obstacles that prevent people and opportunities, especially the poorest and most vulnerable groups. Thanks to digital platforms, people can access unprecedented amounts of information, work online jobs, enroll in ecourses, and even access life-saving care via a telemedicine service (Tsoukatos 2018). Mobile financial services also provide an easy and safe alternative to the traditional banking system. Digital identification systems have allowed millions of marginalized people to prove their identity, exercise their rights, and benefit from essential services such as health or education (Garrone, et al. 2018). The Egyptian government tried to strengthen its efforts for ensuring universal access to broadband services, and to give people the skills and resources they need to participate fully in the digital economy.

The objective of the study is identifying the effect of digital transformation on competitiveness in Egypt using ARDL model. The study is structured as follows. The second section reviews the literature reviews, and analyzes indicators of digital transformation and competitiveness in Egypt. The third section presents the methodology and the fourth section discusses the results, provides some implications, and concludes.

# 2. Literature Review and Analysis of Digital Transformation and Competitiveness indicators in Egypt

The competitiveness depends on input supply factors (production factors), demand in the local market, company structure, competitive strategy, and finally related companies and support (Mukadasi 2018), as well as supportive associations, which lead to the creation and strengthening of capacity. That capacity increases Competitiveness of



The pillars of the competitiveness indicators are related to each other, so that each pillar leads to strengthening the other, and the weakness of one of them often leads to the weakness of other pillars. For example, it is difficult to advance the field of innovation, without the availability of a workforce with health, good education, high training, high skills in absorbing new technologies, with sufficient funding for scientific research, and an effective commodity market that enables new innovations to be directed to the market (WEF 2018). Considering global technological and scientific developments, developing countries should achieve competitive successes in global markets, which poses several challenges. These are mainly represented in changing the traditional comparative advantages in addition to creating and acquiring new ones (Wurlod and Noailly 2018).

In Egypt, there is a high degree of concentration in the country exports, as oil plus several other traditional exports occupy the largest portion of the export proceeds, and as a result, it is necessary to search for more promising export proceeds with comparative advantages in favor of the country. They can be developed over time to be a specific competitive advantage for the country. The patents were confirmed by Akpotaire (2013) as a measure indicative of innovations resulting from scientific research. Patent and technology indicators reflect the innovative performance of scientific research outputs and are used to assess the dissemination of knowledge as patents are important indicators for measuring the results of scientific research that led to innovations.

The index of high-tech exports is one of the indicators indicatives of the outputs of technological innovation driven by scientific research and the academic community. The extent of applications of scientific research and its results in the productive sectors on economic progress, and the extent of their effectiveness and ability to accomplish business and their industrial applications that lead to an increase in the return of foreign currencies. Productive scientific research achieves economic growth and keeps pace with global scientific and technological progress (Suryanto, et al. 2018).



The information sources in companies were emphasized by Vassakis and Tsoukatos (2016) as an important mechanism to enhance the absorptive capacity of innovation and the internal and external performance of innovation in the manufacturing sector. The competitiveness of the manufacturing sector depends on its ability to access information and create knowledge accumulation, which leads to the achievement of performance effective innovation for economic institutions. These information sources are a decisive factor in promoting innovation in industry and knowledge or information management. Economic institutions represent a driving force for innovation, thus achieve competitiveness and presence in the markets then achieve the highest possible return.

#### 2.1. Digital Transformation Indicators in Egypt

The number of internet users in Egypt is about 40.9 million users, with a penetration density of 48% in 2018/2019 (MCIT 2019).



Figure 1. Total fixed and mobile phone subscribers (MCIT 2019)

Source: (Ministry of Communications and Information Technology MCIT 2019)

The total number of mobile and fixed phone subscribers was 101.52 million subscribers in January - March 2019, compared to 106.37 million subscribers in January - March 2018. The total number of mobile phone subscribers reached 93.42 million subscribers in January-March 2019 compared to 99.13 million subscribers in January-March 2018. The number of mobile phone subscribers accounted for about 92% of the total telephone subscribers in January - March 2019 (Figure 1).





Figure 2. Fixed and mobile phone penetration rate

The mobile penetration rate was 94.78% in January - March 2019 compared to 108.82% in January - March 2018, with 14.3% annual rate of change. On the other hand, the fixed line penetration rate was about 7.58% in January - March 2019 (Figure 2).

Figure 3. The telephone lines used and the total capacity of the exchanges



Source: (MCIT 2019)

The total number of fixed telephone lines reached about 8.9 million lines in January - March 2019 compared to about 7.24 million lines in January - March 2018, and the capacity of the fixed phone increased to 22.89 million lines in January - March 2019 compared to about 19.85 million lines in January - March 2018 with an annual increase of 3.4 million lines (Figure 3).

Source: (MCIT 2019)





#### Figure 4. Urban and rural fixed-line subscribers

#### Source: (MCIT 2019)

The number of fixed line subscribers in rural was about 6.31 million lines in January - March 2019 compared to about 5.65 million lines in January - March 2018, while the number of fixed phone subscribers in urban reached about 1.78 million lines in January - March 2019 Compared to 1.59 million lines in January-March 2018 period (Figure 4).



Figure 5. International Capacity of the Internet

Source: (MCIT 2019)

The current capacity of the Internet increased to about 1983 billion pulses / sec in January-March 2019, compared to about 1958 billion pulses / sec in January-March 2018 (Figure 5).



Figure 6. ADSL subscribers



#### Source: (MCIT 2019)

The total number of ADSL subscribers was 6.82 million subscribers in January-March 2019 compared to 5.53 million subscribers in January-March 2018, with an annual increase of 1.29 million subscribers (Figure 6).





Source: (MCIT 2019)

The number of internet users via mobile phone was 35.44 million users in January - March 2019, compared to 31.47 million users during the same period of the previous year. while the number of USB Modem subscribers reached 3.3 million users in January - March 2019, compared to about 2.15 million subscribers during the same period in 2018 (Figure 7).



#### Figure 8. ICT companies that have been established

Number of new companies that have been established



Source: (MCIT 2019)

The number of information and communication technology companies that were established during the period (January - March 2019) reached 456 compared with 357 companies established during the same period of 2018. The capital of these companies amounted to 666.47 million Egyptian pounds during the period (January - March 2019) compared with 326.66 million pounds during the same period in 2018 (Figure 8).





Source: (MCIT 2019)

The value of the Telecom Sector Index in the Egyptian Stock Exchange reached 522 points in January – March 2019 compared with 655 points in January - March 2018. The index includes three companies



working in the telecommunications field, namely Telecom Egypt, Global Telecom Holding and Orascom Communications and Media (Figure 9). **Figure 10.** The infrastructure of communications and information technology in the private sector



Source: (MCIT 2019)

Private sector establishments that have a fixed phone reached 74.9% of the total establishments, while those have a computer reached 82.5% of the total. Establishments that use the Internet reached 65.7%, and the percentage of private sector establishments that have a mobile was 61.4% (Figure 10).





Source: (MCIT 2019)

In the private sector, establishments that have a local network is estimated as 85.5% of the total while the percentage of those with Internet is 41.2%. The percentage of establishments that have Extranet is estimated to be 10.4% (Figure 11).



Egypt was ranked 8<sup>th</sup> in Africa in the field of artificial intelligence, and 111<sup>st</sup> out of 194 countries, in the government readiness report for artificial intelligence in 2019 (Oxford Insights 2019).

#### 2.2. Competitiveness Indicators in Egypt

Egypt Vision 2030 aimed at making the Egyptian economy a disciplined market economy. Such type of economy is characterized by the stability in macroeconomic conditions, the capability of achieving sustainable inclusive growth, the ability of competitiveness, diversity, and the dependence on knowledge. Achieving that type of economy makes the country an active player in the global economy by adapting to global changes and maximizing the added value. In addition to increasing the competitiveness of the Egyptian economy internationally, the contribution of services to the GDP, especially production services will increase.



Figure 12. Egypt's ranking in the Global Competitiveness Index

Source: (World Economic Forum WEF 2019)

In 2019 Egypt was ranked 93<sup>rd</sup> globally compared to the 94<sup>th</sup> and achieved improvement in eight pillars of the competitiveness index and stability compared with those of 2018 (Figure 12).







Figure 13. A comparison of Egypt's ranking in the Global

UAE Source: (WEF 2019)

Egypt was ranked the 13<sup>th</sup> among the countries of the Middle East and North Africa in 2019 instead of the 14<sup>th</sup> in 2018 in the Global Competitiveness Index (Figure 13).





Source: (WEF 2019)

Egypt's ranking in the institutions pillar improved in 2019 from 105<sup>th</sup> in 2017, to 102<sup>nd</sup> in 2018 and to 82<sup>nd</sup> in 2019. The ranking in infrastructure pillar advanced from 58<sup>th</sup> in 2017, to 56<sup>th</sup> in 2018 and to 52<sup>nd</sup> in 2019. Egypt's ranking was declined in the ICT and Macroeconomic stability pillars. In the ICT pillar, ranking was reduced from 96<sup>th</sup> in 2017 to 100<sup>th</sup> in



2018 and to 106<sup>th</sup> in 2019. Macroeconomic stability pillar ranking was declined from 127<sup>th</sup> in 2017 to 135<sup>th</sup> in both 2018 and 2019 (Figure 14). **Figure 15.** The global ranking of Egypt's competitiveness in the human



Source: (WEF 2019)

Egypt's ranking in the education and skills pillar has remained stable in 2018, 2019 at 99<sup>th</sup> globally, while ranking in the health was lowered from  $98^{th}$  in 2017, to  $99^{th}$  in 2018 and to  $104^{th}$  in 2019 (Figure 15).

**Figure 16.** The global ranking of Egypt's competitiveness in the market axis and its pillars



Egypt's ranking in all the pillars of the market axis achieved an improvement in 2019. The market size pillar is one of the most important pillars in the global competitiveness index in which Egypt occupies a very advanced position, which is  $23^{\text{th}}$  (Figure 16).





Figure 17. The global ranking of Egypt's competitiveness in the innovation

Source: (WEF 2019)

Egypt's ranking in the business dynamics pillar advanced from 98<sup>th</sup> in 2017 to 97<sup>th</sup> in 2018 and to 95<sup>th</sup> in 2019. The innovation capacity pillar was advanced as well from 70<sup>th</sup> in 2017, to 64<sup>th</sup> in 2018 and to 61<sup>st</sup> in 2019 (Figure 17).

#### 3. Methodology

The effect of digital transformation on competitiveness in Egypt, during the period (1996 - 2019) was discussed as quadratic data, using ARDL model to measure the short and long run effect between digital transformation and competitiveness. Competitive performance was expressed as a dependent variable, and high technology exports, research and development expenditures, the number of mobile phone subscribers per 100 people, and the number of fixed-line subscribers per 100 people were expressed as independent variables in this model.

The study used the dynamic relation between competitive performance and digital transformation, as follows:

 $MVA = \beta 0 + \beta 1 (MHTEC) + \beta 2 (RDGDP) + \beta 3 (PAT) + \beta 4 (NFDI GDP)$  $+\beta 5 (MOB) + \beta 6 (FTS) + \varepsilon$ 

Where.

MVA: competitive performance.

MHTEC: the high technology exports measured in constant US Dollars.

RDGDP: the research and development expenditure measured in constant US Dollars.

PAT: the number of patents registered by the individual.

NFDI GDP: net foreign direct investment.

MOB: the number of mobile phone subscribers per 100 people.



FTS: the number of fixed-line subscribers per 100 people. ε: the error term

The quadratic annual sample data covered the period of 1996 Q1 to 2019 Q4, and was collected from the World Bank Data Base (2020).

## **3.1. The Unit Root Test**

A unit root test was performed using the augmented Dickey–Fuller (ADF) method to examine the stability of the time series, as the first step to analyze the data and examine the properties of the time series to avoid the false regression problem (Behera, 2015). The null hypothesis was: the time series has a unit root problem (the time series is not static), and the alternative hypothesis was: the time series does not have a unit root problem (the time series is static). Also, the Perron-Phillip Test (PP test) was used to ensure the safety of the results from the Extended Dickey Fuller test (Afshan et al. 2018).

| Table 1. Results of Perron-Phillip Test |           |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
|---|-----------|----------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| At Level                                |           | MVA      | NFDI_GDP    | RDGDP   | PAT     | HTEC    | FTS     | MOB      |
|   | t-        |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| With Constant                           | Statistic | -1.1592  | -1.5953     | -0.7273 | -1.1333 | -3.1842 | -2.1344 | -9.3633  |
|   | Prob.     | 0.6893   | 0.4811      | 0.8340  | 0.7000  | 0.0240  | 0.2319  | 0.0000   |
| With Constant                           | t-        |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| & Trend                                 | Statistic | -1.5197  | -1.5785     | -1.8672 | -2.1342 | -3.7331 | -1.5814 | -1.0764  |
|   | Prob.     | 0.8161   | 0.7943      | 0.6637  | 0.5201  | 0.0248  | 0.7932  | 0.9270   |
| Without                                 |           |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| Constant &                              | t-        |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| Trend                                   | Statistic | 2.8295   | -0.8856     | -1.0898 | 0.9498  | -0.9820 | 0.7272  | -0.4621  |
|   | Prob.     | 0.9988   | 0.3299      | 0.2482  | 0.9081  | 0.2900  | 0.8702  | 0.5126   |
| At First                                |           |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| Difference                              |           | d(MVA)   | d(NFDI_GDP) | d(RDGDP | )d(PAT) | d(HTEC) | )d(FTS) | d(MOB)   |
|   | t-        |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| With Constant                           | Statistic | -10.3497 | -9.6008     | -9.6958 | -9.6944 | -9.5959 | -9.7105 | -10.4966 |
|   | Prob.     | 0.0000   | 0.0000      | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   |
| With Constant                           | t-        |          |             |         |         |         | -       |          |
| & Trend                                 | Statistic | -10.3847 | -9.5533     | -9.6499 | -9.6657 | -9.5466 | 10.4632 | -24.3864 |
|   | Prob.     | 0.0000   | 0.0000      | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0001   |
| Without                                 |           |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| Constant &                              | t-        |          |             |         |         |         |         |          |
| Trend                                   | Statistic | -9.6437  | -9.6437     | -9.6437 | -9.6437 | -9.6437 | -9.6437 | -9.6437  |
|   | Prob.     | 0.0000   | 0.0000      | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000  | 0.0000   |
| Source: by A                            | Author    | using E  | views       |         |         |         |         |          |

**3.1.1. Perron-Phillip Test (PP)** 

urce: by Author using Eviews

The Perron-Phillip Test results showed the time series for HTEC and Mob variables only are static at the level, but the other variables aren't



static. After taking the first differences, the time series of all variables for the first differences are static with a confidence degree of 99% without constant and trend (Table 1).

# **3.1.2.** The Augmented Dickey–Fuller Test (ADF)

| At Level     MVA     NFDI_GDP     RDGDP     PAT     HTEC     FTS     M       t-     -       With Constant Statistic     1.1480     2.7407     0.7272     1.1204     2.0202     1.8062     2.4 | <b>OB</b>    |
|---|--------------|
| t   | 0464         |
| With Constant Statistic 1 1480 2 7407 0 7272 1 1204 2 0202 1 8062 2   | 0464         |
| with Constant Statistic $-1.1489$ $-2.7497$ $-0.7275$ $-1.1204$ $-2.9295$ $1.8962$ $-2.9$   | 0101         |
| Prob. 0.6936 0.0698 0.8340 0.7052 0.0457 0.3328 0.2   | 2669         |
| With Constant t   |              |
| & Trend Statistic -1.5612 -2.7557 -1.8559 -2.0603 -3.4316 1.8700 -1.  | 9018         |
| Prob. 0.8009 0.2176 0.6694 0.5607 0.0533 0.6618 0.6   | 5451         |
| Without   |              |
| Constant & t-   |              |
| Trend Statistic 2.6353 -1.6941 -1.0854 0.9438 -0.9724 0.1621 -0.  | 7599         |
| Prob. 0.9979 0.0853 0.2499 0.9072 0.2939 0.7309 0.3   | 3844         |
| At First  |              |
| Difference d(MVA)d(NFDI_GDP)d(RDGDP)d(PAT) d(HTEC)d(FTS)d(M   | <b>10B</b> ) |
| t   |              |
| With Constant Statistic-10.3482 -2.7238 -9.6958 -9.6944 -9.5959 2.5224 -2.  | 8981         |
| Prob. 0.0000 0.0739 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.1135 0.0   | )496         |
| With Constant t   |              |
| & Trend Statistic-10.3622 -2.7130 -9.6499 -7.1069 -9.5466 2.6430 -1.  | 8976         |
| Prob. 0.0000 0.2340 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.2628 0.6   | 5473         |
| Without   |              |
| Constant & t  |              |
| Trend Statistic -3.1365 -2.7328 -9.6437 -9.6437 -9.6437 2.4972 -4.  | 4505         |
| Prob. 0.0020 0.0067 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0129 0.0   | 0000         |

Source: by Author using Eviews

The augmented Dickey–Fuller (ADF) test results showed the time series for HTEC and NFDI\_GDP variables only are static at the level, but the other variables aren't static. And after taking the first differences, the time series of all variables for the first differences are static with a confidence degree of 99% without constant and trend. So all variables are being stationary at the first difference and no variable is static at the second difference which is a necessary condition for applying ARDL methodology (Table 2).



# 4. Results, Discussion and Conclusions

#### 4.1. Result of the Model

The autoregressive distributed lag ARDL model was used to measure the impact of digital transformation on competitiveness in Egypt during short and long runs, in addition to the ARDL error correction model ECM to ensure the possibility of return to equilibrium, and correction of short run errors in the long run (Afshan and Khan 2018).

#### 4.1.1. The Result of the ARDL Model

The ARDL model result was performed by the following Estimation Equation:

 $\begin{aligned} MVA &= C \ (1)*MVA \ (-1) + C \ (2)*RDGDP + C \ (3)*PAT + C \ (4)*PAT \ (-1) \\ &+ C \ (5)*NFDI_GDP + C \ (6)*MHTEC + C \ (7)*MHTEC \ (-1) + C \\ (8)*MHTEC \ (-2) + C \ (9)*MHTEC \ (-3) + C \ (10)*MHTEC \ (-4) + C \\ (11)*MOB + C \ (12)*MOB \ (-1) + C \ (13)*MOB \ (-2) + C \ (14)*MOB \ (-3) + \\ C \ (15)*MOB \ (-4) + C \ (16)*FTS + C \ (17)*FTS \ (-1) + C \ (18) \end{aligned}$ 

| Variable         | Coefficient | Std. Error         | t-Statistic   | Prob.    |
|------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|
| С                | 0.894601    | 2.338074           | 0.382623      | 0.0103   |
| MVA(-1)          | 0.726867    | 0.055610           | 13.07080      | 0.0000   |
| RDGDP            | 0.407126    | 0.499690           | -0.814758     | 0.0178   |
| PAT              | 0.01023     | 0.001619           | -0.631812     | 0.0295   |
| PAT(-1)          | 0.002310    | 0.001496           | 1.543749      | 0.0269   |
| NFDI_GDP         | 0.049584    | 0.053290           | 0.930465      | 0.0552   |
| MHTEC            | 0.251221    | 0.039612           | 6.342079      | 0.0000   |
| MHTEC(-1)        | -0.169718   | 0.049143           | -3.453592     | 0.0009   |
| MHTEC(-2)        | 1.77E-14    | 0.045758           | 3.87E-13      | 0.0000   |
| MHTEC(-3)        | -2.35E-14   | 0.045758           | -5.14E-13     | 0.0000   |
| MHTEC(-4)        | 0.115310    | 0.038884           | 2.965519      | 0.0041   |
| MOB              | 0.03845     | 0.022034           | -0.174519     | 0.0619   |
| MOB(-1)          | -0.043397   | 0.021927           | -1.979109     | 0.0515   |
| MOB(-2)          | -2.20E-14   | 0.021523           | -1.02E-12     | 0.0000   |
| MOB(-3)          | 3.33E-14    | 0.021523           | 1.55E-12      | 0.0000   |
| MOB(-4)          | 0.051913    | 0.020796           | 2.496298      | 0.0148   |
| FTS              | 0.947438    | 0.145067           | 6.531037      | 0.0000   |
| FTS(-1)          | -0.550182   | 0.134932           | -4.077462     | 0.0001   |
| <b>R-squared</b> | 0.995071    | Mean dependent var |               | 28.93813 |
| Adjusted R-      |             |                    |               |          |
| squared          | 0.993939    | S.D. dep           | endent var    | 8.561606 |
| S.E. of          |             |                    |               |          |
| regression       | 0.666559    | Akaike ir          | nfo criterion | 2.200205 |

**Table 3.** Results of the ARDL Model



| Sum squared        |                |                           |          |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------|
| resid              | 32.87826       | Schwarz criterion         | 2.693598 |
| Log likelihood     | -83.20941      | Hannan-Quinn criter.      | 2.399342 |
| <b>F-statistic</b> | 878.7795       | <b>Durbin-Watson stat</b> | 2.172118 |
| Prob(F-            |                |                           |          |
| statistic)         | 0.000000       |                           |          |
| 0 1 4              | <b>1 . . .</b> |                           |          |

The Substituted Coefficients are as follows (Table 3): MVA = 0.726866906721\*MVA (-1) + 0.40712618941\*RDGDP + 0.0102279605463\*PAT + 0.0023099387979\*PAT (-1) +  $0.0495841477353*NFDI_GDP + 0.251221414636*MHTEC -$  0.169718476122\*MHTEC (-1) + 1.76938060013e-14\*MHTEC (-2) - 2.35344969263e-14\*MHTEC (-3) + 0.115310158008\*MHTEC (-4) + 0. 0384536633724\*MOB - 0.0433965282909\*MOB (-1) - 2.20045098398e- 14\*MOB (-2) + 3.3265443984e-14\*MOB (-3) + 0.0519134826421\*MOB (-4) + 0.947437690197\*FTS - 0.55018178565\*FTS (-1) +0.894601399239

Results indicated that the explanatory level of the model, R-squared, was equal to 0.955, which means that the independent variables can explain about 95.5% of variation in the competitive performance, and the rest were due to other factors, including random errors. Also, the overall significance of the model, F-statistic, was significant (878.77), which means that the estimated model is significant (accepting alternative hypothesis). This indicated that the independent variables have a significant effect on the competitive performance in Egypt. Moreover, results indicated partial significance of the model where parameters were statistically significant. These parameters differed substantially from zero and as a result the importance of the independent variables was reflected.

Given that the value of the Durbin–Watson coefficient was 2.17, the corresponding tabular value indicated that there was no false slope and the estimated model was free of a linear correlation problem between the independent variables. These estimated coefficients were consistent with the economic theory. There was a positive relationship between the competitive performance variable MVA and the lag value of the same variable, as an increase in competitive performance in last year by one point led to a 0.72-point increase in competitive performance in current year. The research and development expenditure positively affected competitive performance as one-point increase led to an increase of 0.41-point in competitive performance, and the number of patents registered by the individual positively affected MVA as one-point increase led to an



increase of 0.01-point in MVA. Moreover, the net foreign direct investment positively affected MVA as one-point increase led to an increase of 0.05-point in MVA, and one-point increase in the high technology exports led to an increase of 0.25-point in competitive performance. Also, the number of mobile phone and fixed-line subscribers positively affected MVA as one-point increase in MOB, FTS led to an increase of 0.03, 0.94-point in competitive performance respectively.

### **4.1.2.** Results of the Model in the Long Term

The ARDL Long run form and Test Bounds were conducted to ascertain whether there is a long-term relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables (Table 4).

| Variabla     | Coefficient | Std Error  | t_Statistic | Droh    |
|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|---------|
| variable     | Coefficient | Stu. Error | t-Statistic | 1100.   |
| C            | 0.894601    | 2.606972   | 0.343157    | 0.07325 |
| MVA(-1)*     | 0.273133    | 0.062006   | -4.404976   | 0.00000 |
| RDGDP**      | 0.407126    | 0.557158   | -0.730719   | 0.04673 |
| PAT(-1)      | 0.001287    | 0.001082   | 1.190094    | 0.02378 |
| NFDI_GDP**   | 0.049584    | 0.059418   | 0.834491    | 0.04067 |
| MHTEC(-1)    | 0.196813    | 0.045875   | 4.290185    | 0.00001 |
| MOB(-1)      | 0.004672    | 0.008867   | 0.526858    | 0.05999 |
| FTS(-1)      | 0.397256    | 0.102678   | 3.868962    | 0.00002 |
| D(PAT)       | -0.001023   | 0.001805   | -0.566644   | 0.05727 |
| D(MHTEC)     | 0.251221    | 0.044168   | 5.687921    | 0.00000 |
| D(MHTEC(-1)) | -0.115310   | 0.043356   | -2.659639   | 0.00096 |
| D(MHTEC(-2)) | -0.115310   | 0.043356   | -2.659639   | 0.00096 |
| D(MHTEC(-3)) | -0.115310   | 0.043356   | -2.659639   | 0.00096 |
| D(MOB)       | -0.003845   | 0.024568   | -0.156518   | 0.08761 |
| D(MOB(-1))   | -0.051913   | 0.023188   | -2.238815   | 0.00282 |
| D(MOB(-2))   | -0.051913   | 0.023188   | -2.238815   | 0.00282 |
| D(MOB(-3))   | -0.051913   | 0.023188   | -2.238815   | 0.00282 |
| D(FTS)       | 0.947438    | 0.161751   | 5.857389    | 0.00000 |

**Table 4.** ARDL Long Run Form and Bounds Test(Conditional Error Correction Regression)

Source: by Author using Eviews

| Table 5. F-Bounds | <b>Test Results</b> |
|-------------------|---------------------|
|-------------------|---------------------|

| Test Statistic | Value    | Signif. | I(0) | I(1) |
|----------------|----------|---------|------|------|
| F-statistic    | 3.700417 | 10%     | 2.12 | 3.23 |
| K              | 6        | 5%      | 2.45 | 3.61 |
|                |          | 2.5%    | 2.75 | 3.99 |
|                |          | 1%      | 3.15 | 4.43 |

Source: by Author using Eviews



| I able 6.         I-Bounds         I est Results |           |         |             |       |  |  |
|--|-----------|---------|-------------|-------|--|--|
| <b>Test Statistic</b>                            | Value     | Signif. | <b>I(0)</b> | I(1)  |  |  |
| t-statistic                                      | -4.404976 | 10%     | -2.57       | -4.04 |  |  |
|  |           | 5%      | -2.86       | -4.38 |  |  |
|  |           | 2.5%    | -3.13       | -4.66 |  |  |
|  |           | 1%      | -3.43       | -4.99 |  |  |

It was evident that the calculated values of F and T (Tables 5 and 6) were greater than the upper and lower limits of the tabular critical values of Pesaran et al. (2000), and as a result, the null hypothesis can be rejected, and we can conclude that there was not co-integration or long run relationships among the variables. The alternative hypothesis can be accepted, and we can conclude that there were co-integration or long run relationships among the model variables.

#### 4.1.3. Results of the Model in the Short Term

ARDL Error Correction Model (ECM) was performed to ensure that there was a short-term relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables, as well as to identify the rate of correction of shortterm deviations over the long term (Cheon and Urpelainen 2012). In other words, the speed at which correction of the short-term deviations and return to the long-term equilibrium position was performed (Tables 7, 8, and 9).

| (Unrestricted Constant and No Trend) |             |            |                    |        |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|--------|--|--|
| Variable                             | Coefficient | Std. Error | <b>T-Statistic</b> | Prob.  |  |  |
| С                                    | 0.894601    | 0.148949   | 6.006100           | 0.0000 |  |  |
| D(PAT)                               | -0.001023   | 0.001543   | -0.662777          | 0.0509 |  |  |
| D(MHTEC)                             | 0.251221    | 0.038293   | 6.560479           | 0.0000 |  |  |
| D(MHTEC(-1))                         | -0.115310   | 0.040479   | -2.848628          | 0.0057 |  |  |
| D(MHTEC(-2))                         | -0.115310   | 0.040479   | -2.848628          | 0.0057 |  |  |
| D(MHTEC(-3))                         | -0.115310   | 0.040479   | -2.848628          | 0.0057 |  |  |
| D(MOB)                               | -0.003845   | 0.019496   | -0.197237          | 0.0442 |  |  |
| D(MOB(-1))                           | -0.051913   | 0.018462   | -2.811900          | 0.0063 |  |  |
| D(MOB(-2))                           | -0.051913   | 0.018462   | -2.811900          | 0.0063 |  |  |
| D(MOB(-3))                           | -0.051913   | 0.018462   | -2.811900          | 0.0063 |  |  |
| D(FTS)                               | 0.947438    | 0.142574   | 6.645231           | 0.0000 |  |  |
| CointEq(-1)*                         | -0.273133   | 0.051614   | -5.291801          | 0.0000 |  |  |

**Table 7.** ARDL Error Correction Regression, ECM Regression
 

Source: by Author using Eviews



| Table 8. F-Bounds Test Results |          |         |       |       |  |
|--------------------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------|--|
| <b>Test Statistic</b>          | Value    | Signif. | I (0) | I (1) |  |
| F-statistic                    | 3.700417 | 10%     | 2.12  | 3.23  |  |
| K                              | 6        | 5%      | 2.45  | 3.61  |  |
|                                |          | 2.5%    | 2.75  | 3.99  |  |
|                                |          | 1%      | 3.15  | 4.43  |  |

| Table 8. | <b>F-Bounds</b> | <b>Test Results</b> |
|----------|-----------------|---------------------|
| I UNIC O | I Doundo        | I COL I CODUICO     |

| Table 9. T-Bounds Test Results |           |         |       |       |  |  |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------|-------|--|--|
| <b>Test Statistic</b>          | Value     | Signif. | I (0) | I (1) |  |  |
| t-statistic                    | -5.291801 | 10%     | -2.57 | -4.04 |  |  |
|                                |           | 5%      | -2.86 | -4.38 |  |  |
|                                |           | 2.5%    | -3.13 | -4.66 |  |  |
|                                |           | 1%      | -3.43 | -4.99 |  |  |

Source: by Author using Eviews

The calculated values of F and T (Tables 8 and 9) are greater than the upper and lower limits of the tabular critical values of Pesaran et al. (2000), and as a result, the null hypothesis can be rejected and the alternative hypothesis that confirms the existence of a short-term relationship between dependent variable and independent variables in the model can be accepted. This confirmed the significance of the short-term relationship.

Accordingly, the Cointegrating Equation can be stated as: D(MVA) = 0.894601399225 - 0.273133093279\*MVA(-1) -0.407126189407\*RDGDP\*\* + 0.001287142743\*PAT (-1) + 0.049584147736\*NFDI\_GDP\*\* + 0.196813096522\*MHTEC (-1) + 0.004671588014\*MOB (-1) + 0.397255904547\*FTS (-1) -0.001022796055\*D (PAT) + 0.251221414636\*D (MHTEC) -0.115310158008\*D(MHTEC (-1)) -0.115310158008\*D (MHTEC(-2)) -0.115310158008\*D (MHTEC (-3)) -0.003845366337\*D (MOB) -0.051913482642\*D (MOB (-1)) -0.051913482642\*D (MOB (-2)) -0.051913482642\*(MVA - (-1.49057803\*RDGDP (-1) + 0.00471251\*PAT (-1) + 0.18153841\*NFDI GDP (-1) + 0.72057580\*MHTEC (-1) + 0.01710371\*MOB (-1) + 1.45444076\*FTS (-1) ) + 0.947437690197\*D (FTS))

### **4.1.4. Results of the Model Quality Tests**

The following tests were performed to examine the quality of the model output (Tables 10 and 11 and Figures 18, 19, and 20):

### 4.1.4.1. Breusch - Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test



| Table 10. Results of           | Breusch-Go | odfrey Serial Correla | ation LM Test |  |  |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------|--|--|
| <b>F-statistic</b>             | 1.327508   | Prob. F (4,70)        | 0.2683        |  |  |
| <b>Obs* R-squared</b>          | 6.486825   | Prob. Chi-Square (4)  | 0.1656        |  |  |
| Source: by Author using Eviews |            |                       |               |  |  |

| Table 10. Results of Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Te | est |
|---|-----|
|---|-----|

There was a good indicator for the model quality since P-value was greater than 5%, which meant accepting the null hypothesis since the residuals have no serial self-correlation and rejecting the alternative hypothesis since the residuals are self-correlated (Table 10).

### **4.1.4.2.** Histogram Normality Test

Histogram Normality test was performed to ensure that residuals had a normal distribution (Figure 18).



Figure 18. Residuals normal distribution and statistical parameters

Source: by Author using Eviews

Values of (Jarque - Bera) and (P-value) were greater than 5% (Probability is 0.000000), accordingly, the null hypothesis can be accepted since residuals had a normal distribution, and the alternative hypothesis can be rejected because residuals did not have a normal distribution (Figure 18). This is a good indicator of the model quality.



# 4.1.4.3. The Heteroscedasticity Test

| Table 11. Heteroskedasticity Test ARCH Results |          |                      |        |  |  |  |
|--|----------|----------------------|--------|--|--|--|
| F-statistic                                    | 0.046034 | Prob. F (4,83)       | 0.9959 |  |  |  |
| Obs*R-squared                                  | 0.194794 | Prob. Chi-Square (4) | 0.9956 |  |  |  |
| Source: by Author using Eviews                 |          |                      |        |  |  |  |

Heteroscedasticity test for residues indicated that there is no variation in the residuals, and the null hypothesis can be accepted which is another good indication of the model quality (Table 11).

#### 4.1.4.4. The Stability Diagnostic Test

The Sum Cumulative test (Cusum test) and the CUSUM of Squares test were performed to ensure that there were no structural changes in the data used in the study and that it is stable over time. The extent of consistency in the model between short-term correction results with longterm parameters, and the structural stability of the parameters (Figure 19).





Figure 20. CUSUM of Squares test showing the stability of the parameters over time



CUSUM statistics were within the critical limits at 5% level of significance, and it was evident that the estimated parameters were structurally stable over time during the study period.

#### **4.2.** Discussion

The analysis of effect of digital transformation on competitiveness in Egypt indicated a significant positive association from 1996 through 2019. These findings are consistent with the conclusions of Hölzl (2009) who analyzed how innovation affected employment growth in 16 economies. His findings indicated an association between technological innovation and increase of competitiveness. Also, he indicated the significance of technological innovation influence on energy intensity in small and medium enterprises (SMEs). The relationship between innovation and employment growth in the United States was assessed by Coad and Rao (2011). They found a positive correlation between innovation and employment growth for fast growing high-tech firms. No correlation was found in high-tech firms which characterized by a negative employment growth. This indicated the relationship between technological innovation and the increase in competitiveness. Similarly, Bogliacino (2012) applied employment empirical analysis on 677 European large publicly traded companies over the period (1990 - 2008) and concluded that there was not a significant effect in low-tech manufacturing sectors, but the effect was evident in high-tech manufacturing. This supports the relationship between



technological innovation and competitiveness. As well as Vivarelli (2014) measured a positive correlation between innovation technology and employment.

Voigt (2014) showed increase in trends of the energy intensity at sampled countries was majorly attributed to increase technological transformation. Van Roy (2015) applied patent data on a sample of European firms over the period (2003-2012), to investigate the innovation and employment nexus. They indicated a positive effect of patenting activities on employment, and the result was significant only in high-tech manufacturing sector. This indicated the relationship between technological innovation and the increase of competitiveness. Wurlod and Noailly (2018) found a negative association between innovation utilizing the proxy of green patents and energy intensity which supports the association between technological innovation and competitiveness. Also, Herrerias (2016) relation between found a positive innovation technology and competitiveness. Kobayashi (2013) indicted that China is progressing towards curtailing rising levels of energy intensive financial systems and the existence of a relationship between technological innovation and increase of competitiveness,

# 4.3. Conclusion

This research provided an economic analysis through the effect of digital transformation on competitiveness in Egypt, adding to the ongoing debate about the factors affects their current situation. Egypt is working hard to achieve high rates of technological innovation, which reflects the country's vision to be highly competitive globally by transferring technology to all economic activities, achieve economic growth and increase international presence and competitiveness.

# References

- Afshan, S., Sharif, A., Loganathan, N., Jammazi, R. 2018. Time–frequency Causality between Stock Prices and Exchange Rates: Further Evidences from Co-integration and Wavelet Analysis. Physical Statistical Mechanics and its Applications. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2017.12.033</u>
- Afshan, Sharif, S., Khan. 2018. Does Democracy Embolden Economic Growth in Pakistan? Evidence from ARDL Bound Testing and Rolling Window Analysis. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*. DOI: 10.1504/IJEBR.2018.089684

Akpotaire, Ufuoma Barbara. 2013. Patent Strategies for Companies Doing



Business in Nigeria, No. 31, pp.40-41.

Behera, J. 2015. Examined the Energy-Led Growth Hypothesis in India, Evidence from Time Series Analysis, Energy Economics Letters. Available at

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/4/2019/11/10\_Chapter-7.pdf

- Bogliacino, Francesco and Marco Vivarelli. 2012. The Job Creation Effect of R&D Expenditures, *Australian Economic Papers*, June. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8454.2012.00425.x
- Cheon, A., J. Urpelainen. 2012. Oil Prices and Energy Technology Innovation: An Empirical Analysis, Global Environmental Change. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.12.001
- Coad, Alex and Rekha Rao-Nicholson. 2011. The Firm-Level Employment Effects of Innovations in High-Tech US Manufacturing Industries, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, vol. 21, issue 2, PP. 255-283. DOI: 10.1007/s00191-010-0209-x
- Dogan, Ebru. 2016. The Effect of Innovation on Competitiveness, Turkey, Istanbul, Istanbul University, Faculty of Economics, pp. 60-65. Available at https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/268727
- Garrone, P., Grilli, L., Mrkajic, B. 2018. The Role of Institutional Pressures in the Introduction of Energy-Efficiency Innovations. Business Strategy and the Environment. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2072
- Henry, U. 2018, Globalization and Environmental Issues: A New Framework for Security Analysis, *Humanities and Social Sciences Letters*. Available at

http://www.conscientiabeam.com/journal/73/abstract/3073

- Hölzl, Werner. 2009. Is the R&D Behaviour of Fast-Growing SMEs Different? Evidence from CIS III Data for 16 Countries. April. Small Business Economics 33(1). PP. 59-75. DOI: 10.1007/s11187-009-9182-x
- Kleynhans, Ewert P.J. 2013. Factors Determining Industrial ompetitiveness and the Role of Spillovers, *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, South Africa, North-West University, Volume 32, Number 2, p.528. DOI: 10.19030/jabr.v32i2.9594
- Kobayashi, T., Kanematsu, H., Hashimoto, R., Morisato, K., Ohashi, N. Yamasaki, H., Takamiya, S. 2013. Study on Environment and Energy Using Belonging Materials. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Policy. Available at https://ideas.repec.org/a/pkp/ijsdwp/2013p50-58.html*
- Ministry of Communications and Information Technology MCIT. 2019.



ICT Indicators Bulletin, March, Egypt, Cairo. Available at https://www.mcit.gov.eg/Upcont/Documents/Publications\_49201900 0\_EN-ICT-Indicators-Quarterly-Bulletin-Q1.pdf Mukadasi, B. 2018. Mixed Cropping Systems for Sustainable Domestic Food Supply of the Smallholder Farming Communities in Nakasongola District, Central Uganda. Canadian Journal of Agriculture and Crops. DOI:10.20448/803.3.1.42.54 Oxford Insights. 2019. The Government Readiness Report for Artificial Intelligence, Oxford. Available at https://www.oxfordinsights.com/ai-readiness2019 Pesaran, M.H., Shin, Y., Smith, R.J. 2000. Structural Analysis of Vector Error Correction Models with Exogenous I(1) Variables, Journal of Econometrics. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4076(99)00073-1 Survanto, T., Haseeb, M., Hartani, N.H. 2018. The Correlates of Developing Green Supply Chain Management Practices: Firms Level Analysis in Malaysia, International Journal of Supply Chain *Management*. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329040632\_The\_Correlate s\_of\_Developing\_Green\_Supply\_Chain\_Management\_Practices\_Fir ms Level Analysis in Malaysia The World Bank Data Base. 2020. Retrieved from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.TRF.PWKR.CD.DT?view= chart. The World Economic Forum WEF. 2019. The Global Competitiveness Report. Available at http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\_TheGlobalCompetitivenessRe port2019.pdf The World Economic Forum WEF. 2018. The Arab World Competitiveness Report 2018. Available at http://www3.weforum.org/docs/Arab-World-Competitiveness-Report-2018/AWCR%202018.0724\_1342.pdf Tsoukatos, Evangelos. 2018. Determinants of Technological and Non-Technological Innovation in SMEs: the Case of Crete, Global Business and Economics Review, Greece, University of Applied Sciences of Crete, Vol. 20, No. 5/6, pp.544-545. DOI: 10.1504/GBER.2018.10009290 United Nations Industrial Development Organization UNIDO. 2013. The Industrial Competitiveness of Nations, Competitive Industrial

Performance Report, Vienna, p.7. Available at

https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2013-



07/Competitive\_Industrial\_Performance\_Report\_UNIDO\_2012\_201 3\_0.PDF

- Van Roy, Benjamin. 2012. Adaptive Execution: Exploration and Learning of Price Impact, SSRN Electronic Journal 63(5), July. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2118111
- Vassakis, Konstantinos, Evangelos Tsoukatos. 2016. Knowledge Management and Innovation in Enterprises: a Theoretical A pproach, The 5th Advanced Research in Scientific Areas, Greece, Technological Educational Institute of Crete Heraklion, p.38. DOI: 10.18638/arsa.2016.5.1.842
- Vivarelli, Marco. 2014. Innovation, Employment and Skills in Advanced and Developing Countries: A Survey of Economic Literature, December. pp. 123-154. https://doi.org/10.2753/JEI0021-3624480106
- Voigt, S., De Cian, E., Schymura, M., Verdolini, E. 2014. Energy Intensity Developments in 40 Major Economies: Structural Change or Technology Improvement? Energy Economics. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2013.10.015
- Wurlod, J.D., Noailly, J. 2018. The Impact of Green Innovation on Energy Intensity: An Empirical Analysis for 14 Industrial Sectors in OECD Countries, Energy Economics. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2017.12.012

https://jsst.journals.ekb.eg/ رابط المجلة: