
Input-Output Efficiency and Regional Convergence Clusters:

Evidence from the Indonesian Provinces 1990-2010

Carlos Mendez*

Abstract This paper studies efficiency convergence across provinces in Indonesia over the 1990-2010 period. Through the lens of both classical and distributional convergence frameworks, the dispersion dynamics of pure technical efficiency and scale efficiency are contrasted. The results suggest that on average there is regional convergence in both measures of efficiency. However, results from the distributional framework indicate the existence of two separate convergence clusters within the pure technical efficiency distribution. Thus, since scale efficiency is characterized by only one convergence cluster, the two clusters of pure technical efficiency appear to be driving the overall efficiency dynamics of Indonesia.

Keywords Efficiency · Convergence · Distribution-based clustering · Nonparametric distribution · Indonesia

JEL Classifications O40 · O47 · R10 · R11

Carlos Mendez*

Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University, Furocho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8601, JAPAN

Tel.: +81-052-789-4345

Homepage: <https://carlos-mendez.rbind.io>

E-mail: carlos@gsid.nagoya-u.ac.jp

1 Introduction

Large per-capita income differences across provinces is a well known issue of the Indonesian economy (Esmara, 1975). Regional income differences seem to persist despite considerable policy efforts that aim to promote a more balanced growth path. Although a series of five-year development plans, fiscal transfer programs, internal migration policies, and integrated economic zones initiatives aimed to reduce regional disparities, the outcomes still remain below their original targets (Akita, 1988; Garcia and Soelistianingsih 1998; Kataoka, 2012).

Both the accumulation of factor inputs and the efficiency with which they are used are two key sources for understanding the large income differences across the Indonesian provinces. However, as noted by Kataoka (2018), relatively few studies have examined the role of efficiency in determining regional income disparities in Indonesia. The work of Kataoka (2018) is one those studies; by estimating the three measures of efficiency of the DEA framework, the results of his study indicate that efficiency differences across provinces have decreased over the 1990-2010 period. In other words, provinces in Indonesia have tended to converge in terms of their relative efficiency levels.

In an attempt to contribute and extend the convergence findings of Kataoka (2018), this paper studies the dynamics of regional efficiency disparities through the lens of both the classical convergence approach of Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1992a) and the distributional convergence approach of Quah (1997). Results from the classical approach suggest that—on average—there is regional convergence in the three measures of efficiency of the DEA framework. Results from the distributional approach, which emphasizes tendencies beyond average behavior, suggest that there are two separate clusters of convergence in overall efficiency (OE) and in pure technical efficiency (PE). In contrast, scale efficiency (SE) is the only variable where the Indonesian provinces appear to be converging to a unique equilibrium. These results imply that the overall dynamics of efficiency appear to be mostly driven by the dynamics of pure technical efficiency and not necessarily scale efficiency.

2 Data and Methods

2.1 Efficiency Measurements and Data

This paper uses efficiency data for 26 contiguous provinces of Indonesia over the 1990-2010 period. More specifically, the data is from the recent work of Kataoka (2018). In this paper, this author uses the Data Envelope Analysis (DEA) framework to quantify the relative efficiency with which inputs are used to produce output at the provincial level in Indonesia. Provincial output is measured by the Gross Regional Domestic Product, and inputs include both measures of human capital (labor force adjusted by educational attainment) and physical capital (measured in in monetary units).

One particularly appealing feature of the DEA framework is that the measured overall efficiency (OE) can be further decomposed into pure technical efficiency (PE) and scale efficiency (SE). Equation 1 summarizes this decomposition:

$$\text{Overall efficiency} = \text{Pure efficiency} * \text{Scale efficiency} \quad (1)$$

At a basic level, pure (technical) efficiency refers to the managerial capability of using inputs and scale efficiency refers to the exploitation of economies of scale by operating at an optimal size. Kataoka (2018, Table 2) provides estimates for these three efficiency measurements for a sample of 26 Indonesian provinces over the 1990-2010 period.

2.2 Classical Convergence Framework

2.2.1 Beta Convergence

The classical convergence framework of Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1991,1992b) for testing the income convergence the macro level has been increasingly applied to the regional-level context (Magrini, 2004). It has also been applied to other variables beyond income. In this framework, the growth rate of a variable, g_y , is a function of its initial level in log terms, $\log(y_0)$. If, in a regression setting, there is an inverse relationship between these two variables, then a process of regional convergence is taking place. This notion of convergence is commonly referred as beta convergence in the economic growth literature. In the context of the current paper, the existence of beta convergence would indicate that the less efficient provinces of Indonesia are catching up with most efficient ones.

2.2.2 Sigma Convergence

There is also a much more general notion of convergence, which is known as sigma convergence. This type of convergence refers to the secular decrease in the cross-regional dispersion of a variable over time. The cross-regional dispersion is then typically measured by the standard deviation of the logarithm of a variable at different time periods.

2.3 Distributional Convergence Framework

The classical convergence framework is sometimes criticized by its excess focus on average behavior and the existence of a unique convergence equilibrium. It ignores possible heterogenous patterns of convergence and the formation of local convergence clusters. Motivated by these limitations, Quah (1993; 1996; 1997) introduced the distributional convergence approach. In contrast to the




Fig. 1 Distribution dynamics framework: A graphical summary

Source: Adapted from Quah (1993).

classical framework, the distributional framework focuses on the dynamics of the entire cross-sectional distribution.¹

Figure 1 shows a graphical summary of the distributional convergence framework. Two essential features should be noted. First, the external-shape dynamics of the distribution indicate the formation of two local convergence clusters. Second, the intra-distributional dynamics indicate the sources of the clustering process. For instance, some regions (such as a and d) may show large and persistent differences over time. Others (such as c), may move forward and catch-up with the upper cluster. And others (such as b), may move backward and catch-down with the bottom cluster.

To formalize the intuition of Figure 1 in the context of the variables of the current paper, let us first define $f_t(x)$ as the cross-regional efficiency distribution at time t and $f_{t+s}(y)$ as the distribution at time $t + s$. Next, the evolution from time t to time $t + s$ is commonly modeled as a first-order autoregressive process of a time-homogeneous Markov chain. That is,

$$\underbrace{f_{t+s}(y)}_{\text{Future Distribution}} = \int \underbrace{f_{t+s|Y_t=x}(y)}_{\text{Stochastic Kernel}} \underbrace{f_t(x)}_{\text{Initial Distribution}} dx, \quad (2)$$

where the transformation of the initial distribution, $f_t(x)$, into the future distribution, $f_{t+s}(y)$, depends on the stochastic kernel, $f_{t+s|Y_t=x}(y)$, which is a transitional operator commonly estimated as a conditional distribution function.

¹ See Epstein et al. (2003), Magrini (2004; 1999), Bianco (2016) or Mendez-Guerra (2018) for more comprehensive presentations of the distributional convergence framework

The stochastic kernel provides valuable information about intra-distributional dynamics and the formation of local convergence clusters. It depends on two components: the unconditional joint distribution, $f_{t,t+s}(y, x)$, and the initial marginal distribution, $f_t(x)$. To evaluate the effect of the former, we will follow the approach of Azzalini et. al (2007) and Menardi and Azzalini (2014). To evaluate the effect of the latter, we will follow the approach of Hyndman et. al (1996).

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Classical Convergence

Table 1 presents the results of the beta convergence framework. The overall finding is that the less efficient provinces are catching up with the most efficient ones. This convergence process is statistically significant, consistent across the three efficiency scores, and considerably fast.

Table 1 Beta convergence across Indonesian Provinces

	Dependent Variable		
	Growth of Overall Efficiency (OE) (1990-2010)	Growth of Pure Efficiency (PE) (1990-2010)	Growth of Scale Efficiency (SE) (1990-2010)
Beta coefficient	- 0.84	-0.91	- 0.91
Speed of convergence	0.09	0.12	0.12
Half-life time (in years)	7.6	5.6	5.7
R-squared	0.84	0.89	0.82
P-value of beta	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 2 Sigma convergence across Indonesian Provinces

	Overall Efficiency (OE)	Pure Efficiency (PE)	Scale Efficiency (SE)
Dispersion in 1990	0.63	0.54	0.46
Dispersion in 2010	0.25	0.18	0.20
Dispersion Ratio $\left(\frac{\sigma_{1990}}{\sigma_{2010}}\right)$	2.53	3.03	2.31
F-Statistic	6.40	9.20	5.30
P-value	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 2 presents the results of the sigma convergence framework. In line with the beta-convergence finding, there is a reduction in the efficiency dispersion over time. This process is both statistically significant and consistent across the three efficiency scores.




Fig. 2 Distributional convergence and clusters in overall efficiency

Notes: Panel A: The unconditional bivariate distribution is estimated using the nonparametric methods described in Menardi and Azzalini (2014). Panel B: The unconditional bivariate distribution is estimated using the nonparametric methods described in Hyndman et. al (1996). Panel C: The distribution-based clusters are identified using algorithm of Menardi and Azzalini (2014). Panel D: The modal boxplots are also described in Hyndman et. al (1996). Darker-shaded stripes indicate higher density areas, and the mode for each conditional density is shown as a bullet point. **Source:** Author’s calculations using data from Kataoka (2018).

3.2 Distributional Convergence

3.2.1 The Clustering Dynamics of Overall Efficiency

Figure 2 shows the distributional convergence results for the overall efficiency score (OE). As shown in Panel (a), the most noticeable feature of the regional dynamics is the existence of two separate clusters. Based on the clustering framework of Azzalini and Torelli (2007), Panel (c) refines the cluster composition by identifying the “core” members in each cluster. Through the lens of this framework, regions are further classified into 3 groups: the core cluster 1, conformed by the low-efficiency regions; the core cluster 2, conformed by the




Fig. 3 Distributional convergence and clusters in pure efficiency

high-efficiency regions; and a remaining group of transitional outliers (marked with the number 0).

Based on the distributional convergence framework of Quah (1996; 1997) and the stochastic kernel estimator of Hyndman, Bashtannyk and Grunwald (1996), Panels (b) and (d) show evolution of the efficiency distribution conditional on its initial level in 1990. On the one hand, the regions with an efficiency score between 0.2 and 0.6 in 1990 tended to convergence to an efficiency score of 0.8 in 2010. On the other, regions with an efficiency score between 0.7 and 1 in 1990 tended to convergence to an efficiency score just under 1 in 2010. These results are consistent with those of Panels (a) and (c) in the sense that the dynamics of the overall efficiency distribution suggest the formation of two different convergence clubs.

3.2.2 On the determinants of overall efficiency: Technical vs Scale efficiency

Figure 3 and Figure 4 show the distributional convergence results for the two sources of overall efficiency (OE): pure technical efficiency (PE) and scale efficiency (SE). On the one hand, the convergence dynamics of PE are largely similar to those of OE. First, the unconditional distribution shows two separate clusters. On the other hand, the dynamics of SE are largely different. There is only one cluster of regions with no transitional outliers.




Fig. 4 Distributional convergence and clusters in scale efficiency

4 Concluding Remarks

Large and persistent per-capita income differences exist across the provinces of Indonesia. Standard economic growth theory suggests that, in a proximate sense, those differences can be driven by differences in capital accumulation and efficiency. Few studies about Indonesia have evaluated the potential role of efficiency. Among them, Kataoka (2018) finds that differences in overall efficiency and its two determinants (pure technical efficiency and scale efficiency) have decreased over the 1990-2010 period.

In this context, this paper evaluates the evolution of provincial efficiency differences through the lens of both the classical convergence approach of Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1992) and the distributional convergence approach of Quah (1997). Results from the classical approach support the previous finding of Kataoka (2018). That is,—on average—there is regional convergence in the three measures of efficiency. However, results from the distributional approach suggest significant heterogeneous patterns of convergence, which go beyond the performance of the average province. In particular, results suggest the existence of two local convergence clusters in both overall efficiency and pure technical efficiency. Scale efficiency is the only variable where the Indonesian provinces appear to be converging to a unique equilibrium. Taken together, these results imply that in order to reduce even further the overall efficiency differences across provinces, additional policy efforts should aim to reduce the distance between the two clusters of pure technical efficiency.

References

- Akita T (1988) Regional development and income disparities in indonesia. *Asian Economic Journal* 2(2):165–191
- Azzalini A, Torelli N (2007) Clustering via nonparametric density estimation. *Statistics and Computing* 17(1):71–80
- Barro R, Sala-i Martin X (1991) Convergence across states and regions. *Brookings papers on economic activity* 1991(1):107–182
- Barro R, Sala-i Martin X (1992a) Convergence. *Journal of Political Economy* 100(2):223–251
- Barro R, Sala-i Martin X (1992b) Regional growth and migration: A japan-united states comparison. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 6(4):312–346
- Bianco SD (2016) Going clubbing in the eighties: convergence in manufacturing sectors at a glance. *Empirical Economics* 50(2):623–659, DOI 10.1007/s00181-015-0940-0
- Epstein P, Howlett P, Schulze MS (2003) Distribution dynamics: stratification, polarization, and convergence among oecd economies, 1870–1992. *Explorations in Economic History* 40(1):78–97
- Esmara H (1975) Regional income disparities. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 11(1):41–57
- Garcia JG, Soelistianingsih L (1998) Why do differences in provincial incomes persist in indonesia? *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 34(1):95–120
- Hyndman R, Bashtannyk D, Grunwald G (1996) Estimating and visualizing conditional densities. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 5(4):315–336
- Kataoka M (2012) Economic growth and interregional resource allocation in indonesia. *Studies in Regional Science* 42(4):911–920
- Kataoka M (2018) Inequality convergence in inefficiency and interprovincial income inequality in indonesia for 1990–2010. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Regional Science* 2(2):297–313
- Magrini S (1999) The evolution of income disparities among the regions of the european union. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 29(2):257–281
- Magrini S (2004) Regional (di) convergence. In: *Handbook of Regional and Urban economics*, vol 4, Elsevier, pp 2741–2796
- Menardi G, Azzalini A (2014) An advancement in clustering via nonparametric density estimation. *Statistics and Computing* 24(5):753–767
- Mendez-Guerra C (2018) On the distribution dynamics of human development: Evidence from the metropolitan regions of Bolivia. *Economics Bulletin* 38(4):2467–2475, URL <https://ideas.repec.org/a/ebl/ecbull/eb-18-00452.html>
- Quah D (1993) Galton’s fallacy and tests of the convergence hypothesis. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 95(4):427–443
- Quah D (1996) Twin peaks: Growth and convergence in models of distribution dynamics. *Economic journal* 106(437):1045–1055
- Quah DT (1997) Empirics for growth and distribution: Stratification, polarization, and convergence clubs. *Journal of Economic Growth* 2(1):27–59, DOI 10.1023/A:1009781613339