ANALYSIS OF CONVERGENCE OF SOME MIDDLE EASTERN COUNTRIES TO EUROPEAN UNION VİA UNIT ROOT TEST

*Oğuzhan GÖKTOLGA**
*Fatma ZEREN***
*AbdullahTORUN****

Abstract

This study is held in order to determine whether some Middle Eastern countries have converged to EU countries in terms of economy and politics as dimensions of globalization. Existence of any convergence is tested via Harvey and Leybourne (2008) linearity tests. As a consequence of the fact that series are non-linear, the existence of any convergence is analyzed via Enders and Granger unit root test. It has been deduced that Kuwait has converged EU-27 average from the point of economic globalization and the country also has converged EU-15 average from the point of social globalization. Similarly, Saudi Arabia has converged EU-9 and EU-15 averages from the point of social globalization. Egypt and Jordan have converged both EU-9 and EU- 15 average from the point of political globalization. Turkey has just converged EU-9 from the point of political globalization. And Iran has just converged EU-15 average from the point of economic globalization. It hasn't been detected any convergence for other countries analyzed.

Keywords: *Convergence, unit root test, European Union, Middle Eastern countries.*

* Doç.Dr. İnönü Üniversitesi İİBF Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, oguzhan.goktolga@inonu.edu.tr

** Prof.Dr. İnönü Üniversitesi İİBF Ekonometri Bölümü, fatma.zeren@inonu.edu.tr

*** Doç.Dr.İnönü Üniversitesi İİBF Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, abdullah.torun@inonu.edu.tr

BAZI ORTA DOĞU ÜLKELERİNİN AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ'NE

YAKINSAMASININ BİRİM KÖK TESTİ İLE ANALİZİ

Öz

Bu çalışmada bazı Orta Doğu ülkelerinin küreselleşmenin ekonomik, politik ve sosyal boyutları açısından AB ülkelerine yakınsama durumu ele alınmıştır. Serilerin doğrusal olup olmadığı Harvey-Leybourne (2007) ve Harvey ve Leybourne (2008) doğrusallık testleri ile incelenmiştir. Serilerin doğrusal dışı olması sebebiyle Enders and Granger (1998) birim kök testi ile yakınsamanın varlığı araştırılmıştır. Çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular doğrultusunda, Kuveyt'in ekonomik küreselleşme açısından AB- 27 ortalamasına ve sosyal küreselleşme açısından ise AB-15 ortalamasına yakınsadığı tespit edilmiştir. Suudi Arabistan'ın ise AB-9 ve AB-15 ortalamasına sosyal küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı görülmüştür. Mısır ve Ürdün, hem AB-9 ortalamasına hem de AB-15 ortalamasına politik küreselleşme açısından yakınsamıştır. Türkiye ise yalnızca AB-9 ortalamasına politik açıdan yakınsamıştır. İran'ın ise yalnızca AB-15 ortalamasına ekonomik küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı sonucuna erişilmiştir. Diğer ülkeler için yakınsama tespit edilmemiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yakınsama, birim kök testi, Avrupa Birliği, Ortadoğu ülkeleri.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this study it is tried to be answered that whether the countries of Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Qatar, Kuwait, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Oman, Jordan and Yemen converged or not to EU countries in terms of economic, political and social dimensions of globalization, within the years 1975 to 2015. Whether series are linear or non linear is tested via applying Harvey-Leybourne (2007) ve Harvey and Leybourne (2008) linearity

tests. As a result of anlysis held, it has been deduced that series have non-
linear structures. Thus, ın this study, Enders Granger nonlinear unit root test
was used. And it has been deduced that Kuwait has converged EU-27 average
from the point of economic globalization and the country also has converged
EU-15 average from the point of social globalization. Similarly, Saudi Arabia has
converged EU-9 and EU-15 averages from the point of social globalization. Egypt
and Jordan have converged both EU-9 and EU- 15 average from the point of
political globalization. Turkey has just converged EU-9 from the point of political
globalization. And Iran has just converged EU-15 average from the point of
economic globalization. It hasn't been detected any convergence for other
countries analyzed.

2. CONCEPTUALIZING GLOBALIZATION

World has been experiencing a transformation process which began in 1970s
and gained acceleration in 1990s. This transformation which has affected
almost all economic, political, social and military relations from forms of
production to consumption habits, has been called as "globalization".
Globalization has become a central concept within both academic studies and
discourses of politicians (Kiely, 2005: 1). Globalization aiming at determining a
post-industrial world, has been considered as a concept which refers to an
increasing interdependence among countries which is basically based on
economic transformations but at the same time which includes transformations
and mobilization at other fields (Kiely, 2005: 2). However, as it is the case at
most of the concepts in social sciences, in addition to its deterministic
definition, globalization ıs a rhetorical concept which may gain meaning
depending on idea, life philosophy, ideology and even expectations of the
person using the concept. Thus, for some, globalization is a descriptive and
neutral concept which describes the condition we live in; whereas for some it is

the new legitimizing discourse of Neo-liberalism, USA and Western hegemony.[*] Another approach argues that since in the process of globalization both non-governmental actors and non-western countries have risen (*the rise of the rest)*, USA hegemony has entered into a collapse period (Zakaria, 2008).

Perspectives such those also include the question of whether globalization is a process or a project. Thus, globalization is a conceptualization with varied dimensions. In compliance with an assessment on globalization, globalization is a process or sum of processes having at least four dimensions (Held et al., 1999:484).

1: Stretching of social, political and economic relations within political borders, regions and continents.

2: Concentration of interdependence parallel to increase of trade, investment, finance, migration and cultural liquidities.

3: Faster mobilization of ideas, goods, information, capital and human beings thanks to development of communication and transportation technologies.

4: Uncertainty of global relations due to reduction of distances among locations, ability of local events to create global consequences and internal problems.

William Robinson who analyzes rhetoric of globalization from a critical perspective, conceptualizes globalization which has gained acceleration from 1970s with five basic plane (Robinson, 2007: 125).

1: Establishment of a global economy which have production, finance and consumption dimensions.

---

[*]For the studies supporting this approach plese see G. John Ikenberry,"Globalization as American Hegemony," David Held and Anthony G: Mcgrew, ed., *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2007, pp.41-58; Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin, "Finance and American Empire," (Edt). Leo Panitch ve Colin Leys, Socialist Register, s. 46-81., Sungur Savran, *Kod Adı Küreselleşme: 21. Yüzyılda Emperyalizm*, Yordam Kitap, İstanbul, 2008.

2: Increase in the consideration of transnational global culture.

3: Spread of new transnational institutions together with spread of global governance perception.

4: Unquestionably, formation of new transnational identities and societal structures due to multi-dimensional mobility of people worldwide.

5: Establishment of new social hierarchies based on inequality.

An important contribution to conceptualization of globalization comes from Aart Scholte. In his study Scholte argues that conceptualization of globalization in the literature is generally made as identical with "internationalization", liberalization", "universalization" and westernization"; but such conceptualizations are inefficient to describe the process we are in. (Scholte, 2005: 54–64). According to Scholte the concept of globalization cannot be conceptualized as internationalization. Internationalization means increase in inter societal interactions. However, such interactions had existed in the past, too. Thus, the conditions we live in cannot be defined with the help of the concept of internationalization. Scholte also argues that conceptualization of globalization as liberalization is not persuasive. Liberalization means increase in commercial interactions and spread of these interactions worldwide. This is also not a new situation. Thus, the concept of liberalization is inefficient to explain present world. Similarly, there exist various historical samples of economic and political convergence related with universalization. Thus, this conceptualization is inefficient, too. Westernization means spread of capitalist system. And this is older than globalization. Eventually, Scholte argues that in order to understand the circumstances we live in, we need a concept apart from the concepts mentioned above. According to Scholte the concept of "deterritorialization which means the spread of supraterritorial-connections is the most suitable

concept to understand economic, political and social interactions which we experience at the present.

Globalization is not a condition which is immanent just for states or specific societies. But at the same time it is not a reality ongoing in exteriorities of States and societies. It is a process within which both inside and outside transform.

In the axis of these paradigms, since 1970s the rhetoric of globalization has been argued in varied fields of social sciences and distinctive theoretical perspectives have been created. In context of these theories, phenomenon of globalization has been analyzed within economic, political, military and social planes. The main reason for argument of globalization in varied fields of social sciences is that, unlike former transformation processes, within this process almost all societies transform in similar manners simultaneously. This process which we can define as a Neo-liberal restoration period at a global level, is not only a transformation out of the States, but also a transformation which has been affecting inner structures of the States, Dynamics of economic and social lives and thus has gained such a dimension that it is considered that the distinction between inner and outer is meaningless.

Despite various conceptualizations, it may be argued that the globalization lasts depending on two dimensions: increase in both inter societal connectivity and global consciousness (Robinson, White, 2007: 64). Inter societal connectivity and consciousness maintain their effects on economy, politics, society and culture.

Even conceptualization of globalization varies, debates on the concept focus on development of inter societal interaction. In this context, from the point of this

study we can define globalization as "increase and condensation of economic, political, social and cultural relations".

Main problematics of approaches which are named as globalization theories and are reflected to various fields of social sciences are as such: Is globalization historical? Whether its roots are in the past of human history or is it a new process? Is the globalization a process or a Project? Has the globalization got an object, if yes, who is it or who are they? Is the globalization a process controllable or reversible? Even its economic dimension is dominant, are there any fields on which globalization is effective? It is possible to raise these questions. However, in pursuance of the scope of this study, it is tried to analyze the approaches of globalization theories to these questions.

3. APPROACHES TO GLOBALIZATION

It is a fact that there is a huge literature on how to conceptualize globalization. So, in this study we will not argue what the globalization is (or is not). Globalization conceptualization of three globalization theories will be examined: Hyperglobalizer, sceptic and transformationalist approaches.

3.1. Hyperglobalist Approach

This approach known as hyperglobalizers and interpreting globalization mainly from the perspective of economic and technological determinism, equates globalization with neo-liberalism. In view of this approach, globalization is a fact of life and it is irreversible (Kiely, 2005: 3). In view of this approach globalization defines a new period in which societies are more and more exposed to global market discipline (Held et al., 1999: 2).

From the perspective of hyperglobalist approaches, increase in transnational interaction has caused in weakening of "nationality" characteristic. Especially in the economic sphere, mobility in the fields of production, trade and finance have weakened the nationalistic characteristic of national economies (Strange, 2000: 149). From the perspective of hyberglobalists approaches, may cause in formation of other global formations which will wherrret nation-state structures, thus nation-states may be unable to maintain their traditional functions (Ohmae, 1995: 2). So, from the perspective of hyperglobalist approaches, nationalities and nation states in traditional manner have replaced with Dynamics of globalization.

3.2 . Skeptical Approach

Skeptical approaches which interpret globalization as a Project of Western and American hegemony, consist of mainly Marxist and Neo-Marxist theorists who interpret the process and dynamics from a critical perspective.

Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson who are leading supporters of the sceptic approach and who define the globalization as a myth lean their argument on these assumptions (Hirst, Thompson, 1998: 27-28).

1: The present highly internationalized economy is not unprecedented. It is one of the transformation processes. Moreover, the present economic order is less open and less integrated than the economical mechanism of 1870-1914 period.

2: Transnational firms are relatively less than in the past, because most of these are based nationally and they trade regionally or internationally according to production and sales location.

3: There is not a condition in which the capital insentively flows from advanced to developing countries increasing investment and employment. Moreover, since the capital mobility is among developed industrialized countries, Third

World countries, except a minority, remains marginal in capital mobility, investment, increase in employment and trade.

4: World economy does not reflect a real "global" condition as globalizer approaches advocate. Trade, investment and financial mobility experienced in international arena are concentrated among Europe, Northern America and Japan.

5: These three major economic Powers have a capacity to exert governance pressure on other economies. Thus, even limited by major economic powers, global markets are no means beyond control and regulation.

Eventually, the following statement of Hirst and Thompson summarize the Notion of sceptics against globalization: globalization is a proper myth for an illusionless world, but it also destroys our hopes (Hirst, Thompson, 1998: 31).

Alejandro Colas, admits that use of globalization as a concept determining concentration of mutual socio-economic and political links which have exceeded national borders, has been used intensively since 1990s. Yet, Colas objects opinions of some of the hyperglobalizers that this phenomenon is a process homogenizing social relations worldwide o these relations get closer (Colas, 2008: 125). Because, according to Colas, globalization is a very unequal process tending to reproduce both new and existing economic, social and political hierarchies (Colas, 2008: 125). In addition, Colas while forming a perspective different from anti-globalizers, advocates that neoliberalism does not result in capitalist globalization causes global capitalism even it has some facilitative effects on the process. Colas advocates that globalization develops in three dimensions: gaining a "transnational" dimension of neoliberalism in the axis of Washington Consensus; rise of New Right as a consequence of loss of leftist movements; and strengthening of international financial institutions (IFIs) (Colas, 2008: 132-137).

3.3 . Transformationalist Approach

Advocators of transformationalist approach consist of people from various theoretical and methodological traditions. Far from hyperglobalizers, they do not interpret globalization just from the perspective of economy; rather they put forward multidimensionality of globalization. They analyze globalization through its sociological, political, technological and cultural dimensions. They neither set up a special goal to globalization nor they expect that globalization will provide more welfare or a more peaceful world and nor believe that globalization will create a single world nor it will create a conflicting process (McGrew, 2008: 37).

Transformationalist neither agree that globalization is unprecedented as hyperglobalizers do, nor they believe that globalization is a new period, as sceptics do. For transformationalists, globalization is a process which has its own historical roots.

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

After James Watt's modernization of vapor machine logic and adapting it to industry in 1796, England has adapted it to production process. As a consequence, formation of political and economic conditions necessary for depleting increasing surplus is the most important historical development which lay the foundations of globalization.

At a study held by Alden, Kelley, Riefler, Lee and Soutar (2013) it has been found out that if the consumers' attitude against globalization is negative, their attitude against global brands are also negative and it has also been found out that this negative attitude roots in their attitude that global brands are poor graded.

In his "What is Globalization" Ulrich Beck asserts that globalization is not one dimensional. He disaggregates globalization into three dimensions: Globalism, globality and globalization. For him, the concept "globalism" the process in degraded into just economic dimension and neoliberalist ideological dimension of the phenomenon is emphasized. In this way, within ideological conceptualization, other dimensions of globalization such as environment, culture, politics and civil society are placed under the authority of world market economy.

According to Feenstra (1998), globalization effect on change of bargaining power of labor and capital, has very significant consequences. Weakening the power of labor unions (elasticity in labor market) within industry influenced by trade may have a significant contribution to wages inequality in developed countries. Factors having effects on weakening the financial conditions of low-qualified workers are globalization and new Technologies. Globalization both creates new markets to products and services produced through intensive information technologies and helps advancement of technological transformation to the detriment of unqualified labor force.

Edwards (1997), has analyzed the influence of relation between trade policy and income distribution to Gini coefficient in terms of six distinct indicators of trade openness index. In the study, it is concluded that there exists no significant evidence to prove that liberalization of trade and globalization has influence on income inequality.

Goldberg and Pavcnik (2007), in contrast to Hecksher-Ohlin theory, has analyzed the increasing wage inequality between qualified and unqualified workers in developing countries. According to findings of the search, increase in capital flow to developing countries and skilled technological advancement are among the explanations to increasing income inequality as a consequence of globalization.

Faustino and Vali (2011) have analyzed effects on globalization on income inequality in OECD countries through static (fixed effect) and dynamic (GMM) panel analysis using data for period of 1995-2007. In view of the results of the study, static and dynamic predictions confirm negative effect of liberalization of trade on Gini index, and this in turn indicates that trade and globalization decreases income inequality in rich OECD countries. Results of the study also confirm the hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between income inequality and economic development.

Pillai (2011), has analyzed globalization and income inequality in OECD and poor countries separately. This analysis has included commercial globalization and direct foreign investment (DFI), too. In the study it is concluded that countries with low income level utilize from increasing trade whereas direct foreign investment creates more income inequality in countries having low income level.

Chordokrak and Chintrakarn (2011), have predicted effects of globalization and technological developments on income inequality in USA. Using panel data for 1988–2003 period, they have asserted that direct foreign investment statistically increases income inequality. They have also concluded that trade my increase high income shares.

Yanar and Şahbaz (2013), have tested effects of globalization on poverty and income inequality in 102 developing countries through cross-section analysis using data for the year 2010. They have concluded that globalization decreases income inequality and poverty.

Hennighausen (2014), has analyzed the correlation between globalization and income inequality by examining also the role of distribution mechanisms. At the study, data for 28 OECD countries between 1960 and 2010 have been analyzed. Major findings indicate that globalization actually changes relative charges of

factors of productions; in the meantime, international trade and capital mobility does not increase income inequality in industrialized countries.

Baek and Shi (2016), have disaggregated economic globalization into two parts as concentration of trade and financial integration and then analyzed effects of globalization in developed and developing countries in within the context of income inequality and globalization. In this study, data for 26 developed and 52 developing countries for 1990-2010 period in which globalization accelerated have been used. And it has been concluded that financial integration and financial integration and trade concentration effect income inequality in different manners and the effect is divergent in developed and developing countries. That is to say, increase in trade concentration increases income inequality in developed countries, whereas it reduces income inequality in developing countries. In view of the findings of the study, deepening of financial integration reduces income inequality in developed countries, whereas it increases income inequality in developing countries.

5. DATA and METHODOLOGY

This analysis has been made on Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Qatar, Kuwait, Lebanon, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Oman, Jordan and Yemen. Data used in the analysis involves data of 1970-2015 period.

In time series analysis, there are nonlinear tests used to determine whether series is linear or not. Among these tests, Harvey-Leybourne (2007) and Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008) tests are more advantageous since they do not pay attention to stability for variables. Thus, in this study Harvey-Leybourne nonlinear tests have been used.

Harvey-Leybourne, at his study made in 2007 suggested use of the following equation.

$$Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Y_{t-1} + \beta_2 Y_{t-1}^2 + \beta_3 Y_{t-1}^3 + \beta_4 \Delta Y_{t-1} + \beta_5 (\Delta Y_{t-1})^2 + \beta_6 (\Delta Y_{t-1})^3 + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

Basic hypothesis which should be used fort he equation is as;

$$H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_5 = \beta_6 = 0$$

Alternative hypothesis that should be hypothesized is as;

$$H_1: \text{At least one parameter should be different from zero. is}$$

Test statistic that should be used has been stated as;

$$W_t = \frac{RSS_1 - RSS_0}{RSS_0 / T}$$

Here, RSS refers to residual sum of squares and T refers to number of observations. Harvey-Leybourne (2007) test statistic indicates χ^2 distribution.

Harvey-Leybourne at his study held in 2008 suggested to use the following equation for stationary series;

$$Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Y_{t-1} + \beta_2 Y_{t-1}^2 + \beta_3 Y_{t-1}^3 + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_{4,j} \Delta Y_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t$$

(2)

Hypothesis that should be used under linearity hypothesis is as;

$$H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0 \text{ (linearity)}$$

$$H_1 : \beta_2 \neq 0 \text{ veya } \beta_3 \neq 0 \text{ (non-linearity)}$$

Test statistic that should be used is as;

$$W_0 = T \left(\frac{RSS_0^T}{RSS_0^u} - 1 \right)$$

RSS_0^T term used in test statistic refers to residual sum of squares of restricted model and RSS_0^u term refers to residual sum of squares of unrestricted model. Harvey-Leybourne at his study held in 2008 suggested to use the following equation for stationary series;

$$\Delta Y_t = \lambda_1 \Delta Y_{t-1} + \lambda_2 (\Delta Y_{t-1})^2 + \lambda_3 (\Delta Y_{t-1})^3 + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_4 \Delta Y_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t$$

(3)

Hypothesis which should be used under non-linearity hypothesis is as follows;

$H_0{:}\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ (linearity)

$H_1{:}\lambda_2 \neq 0$ veya $\lambda_3 \neq 0$ (non-linearity)

Test statistic that should be used is as;

$$W_1 = T\left(\frac{RSS_1^T}{RSS_1^u} - 1\right)$$

(4)

RSS_1^T term used in test statistic refers to residual sum of squares of restricted model and RSS_1^u term refers to residual sum of squares of unrestricted model.

Harvey-Leybourn's study held in 2008 has suggested that where the stationary characteristics are not clearly known, both of the test statistics should be used and when used the test statistic which should be used is as follows;

$$W_t = (1 - \lambda)W_0 + \lambda W_1$$

(5)

W_t test statistic calculated demonstrates χ2 distribution.

After determination of nonlinearity, non-linear unit should be analyzed through root tests. For non-linear time series Enders and Granger (1998), Leybourne, Newbold and Vougas (1998), Caner and Hansen (2001) and Park and Shintani (2005) etc. have built up many unit root tests.

At this study unit root analysis of variables have been held by using Enders and Granger (1998) Unit Root Test. Enders Granger Unit Root Test may be stated as follows with the help of Fuller unit root test;

$$\Delta Y_y = \rho Y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$

(6)

Enders and Granger, have extended the mentioned Dickey Fuller test as follows;

$$\Delta Y_t = I_t \rho_1 [Y_{t-1} - \alpha_0] + (1 - I_t)\rho_2 [Y_{t-1} - \alpha_0] + \varepsilon_t$$

(7)

At extended Dickey Fuller equation α_0 demonstrates threshold value and I_t demonstrates indicator function. When the error terms are correlated, the

following equation has been built up through by adding lagged values of dependent variable to extended Dickey Fuller equation;

$$\Delta Y_t = I_t \rho_1 [Y_{t-1} - \alpha_0] + (1 - I_t) \rho_2 [Y_{t-1} - \alpha_0] + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \beta_i \Delta Y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t$$

(8)

I_t indicator function of Enders and Granger (1998) unit root test based on TAR model is as follows;

$$I_t = \begin{cases} Y_{t-1} \geq \alpha_0 \ ise \ 1 \\ Y_{t-1} < \alpha_0 \ ise \ 0 \end{cases}$$

I_t indicator function of Enders and Granger (1998) unit root test based on MTAR model is as follows;

$$I_t = \begin{cases} \Delta Y_{t-1} \geq \alpha_0 \ ise \ 1 \\ \Delta Y_{t-1} < \alpha_0 \ ise \ 0 \end{cases}$$

The basic difference between Enders and Granger (1998) threshold unit root tests based on TAR and M-TAR models is that; while asymmetric adjustment is dependent on Y_{t-1} at TAR model, it is dependent to ΔY_{t-1} at M-TAR model. At both models, the hypothesis to test the existence of non-linear unit root should be as;;

$$H_0: \rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0$$

The hypothesis above in order to test the existence of non-linear unit root demonstrates that series is not stationary. F statistics calculated to test this statistics is indicated as φ statistics for TAR model and φ* statistics for M-TAR model.

These statistics calculated for TAR and M-TAR models are greater than table critical values indicated at the article by Enders and Granger (1998), H_0 hypothesis is rejected and it is concluded that the series is stationary.

6. APPLICATION RESULTS

At this study, unit root test is used in order to analyze convergence. Examination of convergence via time series analysis has been suggested by Carlino and Mills (1996), Bernard and Durlauf (1995) and Binder and Peseran (1999). To do this, initially logarithm of units' (whose convergence will be analysed) proportions to the units which convergence to them will be analyzed. And a serie as follows obtained:

$$X_{i,t} = ln\frac{Y_{i,t}}{\bar{Y}_{j,t}}$$

(9)

Here $Y_{i,t}$, demonstrates globalization index of the countries of Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Qatar, Quwait, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Oman and Yemen. And $\bar{Y}_{j,t}$ is a avarage of globalization index bleonging to EU countries. EU countries have handled respectively as EU-9, EU-15, and EU-27. Then, stationarity of the obtained series such as (9) is analyzed via unit root tests. If the mean and variance of the series is not changed during periods, then it is concluded that there exists convergence among the units analyzed. (Bernard ve Durlauf, 1996). If the series is not stationary, then it means that there is not a convergence.

Before unit root test, linearity hypothesis is tested and then, the unit root test suitable is applied. Unit root tests are classified in terms of linearity or non-linearity of series. So, before applying unit root test it has to be tested that whether series are linear or not. Commonly used tests fort his are Harvey-Leybourne (2007) and Harvey and Leybourne (2008) linearity tests.

Convergence process is reported respectively for EU-9 and EU-15, and then for EU-27.

In order to prove the convergence to EU-9 countries in terms of economic globalization, linearity test is applied to the series above. Linearity test results are as follows:

Table 1: Linearity Results for Economic Globalization

Countries	Harvey Leybourne and Xiao (2008)	Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_{10} W_5	W_1	
Egypt	9.38***	21.06*	21.21**	21.5***
Israel	8.7***	11.51*	11.61**	11.79***
Iran	5.07***	7.1*	7.14**	7.21***
Iraq	15.09***	8.5*	8.69**	9.05***
Lebanon	14.61***	7.82*	7.9**	8.05***
Saudi Arabia	13.76***	0.84*	0.96**	1.22***
Turkey	1.86***	13.23*	13.4**	13.69***
United Arab Emirates	16.15***	26.16*	26.28**	26.49***
Yemen	5.66***	7.98*	8.31**	8.91***

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5 % and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60.
Harvey and Leybourne (2007 test critical values for 1%, 5 % and 10% are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 and 7.77.
*** and*** demonstrates that linearity basic hypothesis for 1%, 5 % and 10% is rejected.

According to results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 1, it is demonstrated that economic globalization has a non-linear structure for all of the countries. Here we had better use nonlinear unit root tests rather than linear unit root tests.

Results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test for economic globalization are demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Non-linear Unit Root Test for Economic Globalization

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	Convergence
Egypt	0.9806	14	nonconvergence
Israel	0.4261	14	nonconvergence
Iran	0.6497	14	nonconvergence
Iraq	0.3944	7	nonconvergence
Lebanon	1.2248	14	nonconvergence
Saudi Arabia	0.4648	14	nonconvergence
Turkey	0.9167	14	nonconvergence
United Arab Emirates	0.9807	13	nonconvergence
Yemen	0.9167	14	nonconvergence

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 2, economic globalization series at (9) is not stationary for all the countries. Thus, it is clear that economic globalization convergence to EU-9 countries has not occurred.

Table 3: Linearity Test for Political Globalization

Countries	Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008)	Harvey-Leybourne (2007)		
		W_{10}	W_5	W_1
Egypt	5.75***	0.87*	0.87**	0.88***
Jordan	1.71***	8.22*	8.25**	8.3***
Iraq	7.79***	14.71*	14.78**	14.92***
Kuwait	7.53***	31.82*	32.16**	32.76***
Oman	0.92***	12.6*	12.7**	12.89***
Turkey	6.25***	3.57*	3.63**	3.74***

Note: Harvey et.al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5 % and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60. Harvey ve Leybourne (2007) test critical values for 1%, 5 % and 10% are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 ve 7.77.
*** and*** demonstrates that linearity basic hypothesis for 1%, 5% and 10%is rejected.

According to results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 3, it is demonstrated that political globalization has a non-linear structure for all of the countries. Here we had better use nonlinear unit root tests rather than linear unit root tests.

The results of Enders Granger nonlinear unit root tests applied to analyze convergence in terms of political globalization are demonstrated at Table 4.

Table 4: Unit Root Test Results for Political Globalization

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Egypt	6.1302	12	convergence
Jordan	7.5644	14	convergence
Iraq	0.2594	13	nonconvergence
Kuwait	0.9597	10	nonconvergence
Oman	1.3866	13	nonconvergence

	12.8836	14	convergence
Turkey			

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for 1%, 5 % and 10% are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results demonstrated at Table 4, Egypt, Jordan and Turkey have converged to EU-9, whereas Iraq, Kuwait and Oman have not.

Table 5: Linearity Test Results for Social Globalization

Countries	Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008)	Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_5	W_1	W_{10}
Bahrain	2.09***	8.14*	8.18**	8.25***
Egypt	1.32***	9.46*	9.72**	10.2***
Jordan	5.97***	14.46*	14.66**	15.03***
Israel	4.64***	8.97*	9.11**	9.35***
Iran	5.15***	13.46*	13.61**	13.9***
Quwait	3.22***	16.12*	16.29**	16.6***
Qatar	4.44***	8.17*	8.24**	8.37***
Saudi Arabia	11.92***	3.22*	3.56**	4.27***
Syria	3.33***	12.83*	12.98**	13.24***
UAE	1.73***	11.73*	11.87**	12.13***
Yemen	5.04***	7.93*	7.97**	8.05***

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 ve 4.60. Harvey and Leybourne (2007) test critical values 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 and 7.7. *** and*** for 1%, 5% and 10% respectively means that linearity main hypothesis is rejected.

According to results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 3, it is demonstrated that political globalization has a non-linear structure for all of the countries. Thus, in order to analyze whether these countries have converged to EU-9 countries in terms of social globalization, Enders Granger nonlinear unit root test is applied, and the results are demonstrated at Table 6.

Table 6: Social Globalization Unit Root Test Results

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Bahrain	0.0957	14	nonconvergence
Egypt	1.6117	14	nonconvergence
Jordan	0.9836	11	nonconvergence
Israel	0.7372	13	nonconvergence
Iran	1.3916	11	nonconvergence
Quwait	3.3638	12	nonconvergence
Qatar	1.2781	14	nonconvergence
Saudi Arabia	9.8519	12	convergence
Syria	0.4490	14	nonconvergence
UAE	2.6094	14	nonconvergence
Yemen	0.2810	14	nonconvergence

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 6, it is seen that only Saudi Arabia has converged to EU-9 whereas other countries have not.

So far in this study, convergence to EU-9 countries in terms of sub dimensions of globalization is held. Since the number of countries at EU-15 countries is more than EU-9 countries; it is also analyzed that whether existence of these extra countries have changed the situation in terms of convergence. Convergence to EU-15 countries will be analyzed in terms of economic, political and social globalization respectively. Linearity test for economic linearity is as follows:

Table 7: Linearity Test Results for Economic Globalization

| Countries | Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008) | Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_{10} | | |
		W_5	W_1	
Egypt	17.21***	16.48*	17.01**	17.99***
Israel	8.56***	11.24*	11.33**	11.5***
Iran	6.24***	7.18*	7.22**	7.28***
Iraq	14.2***	7.47*	7.64**	7.94***
Kuwait	0.44***	16.08*	16.28**	16.64***
Lebanon	14.75***	13.07*	13.2**	13.44***
Saudi Arabia	7.37***	0.55*	0.64**	0.84***
Turkey	2.77***	18.78*	18.99**	19.39***
UAE	9.85***	19.16*	19.29**	19.52***
Yemen	6.55***	8.49*	8.87**	9.59***

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for %1, %5 ve %10 are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60. Harvey and Leybourne (2007) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 and 7.7. *** and*** for 1%, 5% and 10% respectively means that linearity main hypothesis is rejected.

According to the results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 7, converted economic globalization series has a non-linear structure. The results of Enders Granger nonlinear unit root tests are demonstrated at Table 8.

Table 8: Non-linear Unit Root Test Results for Economic Globalization

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Egypt	1.1263	14	nonconvergence
Israel	0.4418	14	nonconvergence
Iran	4.4981	14	convergence
Iraq	0.2418	7	nonconvergence
Kuwait	1.2690	14	nonconvergence

Lebanon	0.5539	14	nonconvergence
Saudi Arabia	0.1271	14	nonconvergence
Turkey	0.8054	14	nonconvergence
UAE	1.1858	13	nonconvergence
Yemen	0.9933	14	Nonconvergence

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 8, it is confirmed that only Iran has converged to EU-15 countries whereas other countries have not.

Table 9: Linearity Test Results for Political Globalization

Countries	Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008)	Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_5	W_1	W_{10}
Egypt	5***	0.53*	0.53**	0.53***
Iraq	9.02***	17.69*	17.78**	17.95***
Kuwait	7.92***	16.96*	17.18**	17.57***
Oman	1.03***	14.1*	14.23**	14.46***
Syria	4.85***	7.51*	7.54**	7.59***

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60. Harvey and Leybourne (2007) test critical values for %1, %5 and %10 are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 and 7.7. *** and*** for 1%, 5% and 10%respectively means that linearity main hypothesis is rejected.

According to results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 9, it is demonstrated that political globalization has a non-linear structure for all of the countries. Here, non-linear unit root tests should be substituted with linear unit root tests.

The results of Enders Granger nonlinear unit root test are demonstrated at Table 10.

Table 10: Non-linear Unit Root Test Results for Political Globalization

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Egypt	3.3052	8	convergence
Jordan	6.7751	14	convergence
Iraq	0.3279	13	nonconvergence
Kuwait	0.5003	10	nonconvergence
Oman	1.3090	13	nonconvergence
Syria	0.5234	10	nonconvergence

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for %1, %5 ve %10 are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 10, it is seen that Egypt and Jordan are stationary, thus it can be argued that these countries have converged to EU-15 whereas the other countries have not.

Table 11: Linearity Test for Social Globalization

Countries	Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008)	Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_5	W_1	W_{10}
Egypt	1.37***	8.84*	9.07**	9.48***
Jordan	5.34***	12.2*	12.43**	12.83***
Israel	8.19***	10.25*	10.4**	10.67***
Iran	4.66***	13.65*	13.8**	14.08***
Kuwait	7.59***	20.09*	20.29**	20.65***
Saudi Arabia	10.39***	6.91*	7.36**	8.23***
Syria	3.49***	11.53*	11.66**	11.9***

| UAE | 1.82*** | 11.18* | 11.34** | 11.62*** |
| Yemen | 5.12*** | 5.74* | 5.78** | 5.85*** |

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60. Harvey and Leybourne (2007) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 and 7.7. *** and*** for 1%, 5% and 10% respectively means that linearity main hypothesis is rejected.

According to the results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 11, it is demonstrated that social globalization has a non-linear structure for all the countries.

The results of Enders Granger nonlinear unit root test are demonstrated at Table 12.

Table 12: Non-linear Unit Root Test for Social Globalization

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Egypt	0.7551	14	nonconvergence
Jordan	0.7513	11	nonconvergence
Israel	1.0039	12	nonconvergence
Iran	0.7090	11	nonconvergence
Kuwait	4.5120	12	convergence
Saudi Arabia	11.1304	12	convergence
Syria	0.6090	14	nonconvergence
UAE	3.4790	14	convergence
Yemen	1.9351	6	nonconvergence

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 12, it is seen that Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have converged to EU-15 in terms of social globalization whereas other countries have not.

Another comparison with respect to globalization will be held in comparison with EU-27 countries. Convergence will be held in terms of economic, political and social globalization respectively. Linearity test results for economic globalization are demonstrated at Table 13.

Table 13: Linearity Test Results for Economic Globalization

Countries	Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008)	Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_5	W_1	W_{10}
Bahrain	16.22***	21.25*	21.42**	21.73***
Kuwait	8.99***	10.01*	10.07**	10.18***
Oman	4.81***	8.05*	8.11**	8.21***
Lebanon	10.19***	10*	10.07**	10.18***
Saudi Arabia	10.27***	2.81*	2.93**	3.14***
Turkey	1.18***	8.00*	8.05**	8.15***
UAE	6.63***	9.99*	10.03**	10.11***
Yemen	7.01***	6.84*	7.04**	7.4***

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60. Harvey and Leybourne (2007) test critical values for %1, %5 ve %10 are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 and 7.7. ,** and*** for 1%, 5% and 10% respectively means that linearity main hypothesis is rejected.

According to the results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 13, it is demonstrated that economic globalization has a non-linear structure for all of the countries. The results of unit root test for economic globalization series for these countries are demonstrated at Table 14.

Table 14: Results of Non-linear Unit Root Test for Economic Globalization

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Bahrain	0.1359	8	Nonconvergence
Kuwait	3.4323	8	convergence
Oman	2.0659	9	nonconvergence
Lebanon	0.6355	5	nonconvergence
Saudi Arabia	0.5976	7	nonconvergence
Turkey	1.8377	9	nonconvergence
UAE	1.5581	4	nonconvergence
Yemen	0.4200	14	nonconvergence

Not: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 12, it is seen that just Kuwait has converged to EU-27 average in terms of social globalization whereas other countries have not.

Linearity test results for political globalization are demonstrated at Table 15.

Table 15: Linearity Test Results for Political Globalization

Countries	Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008)	Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_5	W_1	W_{10}
Israel	6.99***	88.31*	88.98**	90.19***
Iran	4.84***	53.15*	53.59**	54.38***
Iraq	5.5***	29.06*	29.28**	29.68***
Oman	11.77***	1.77*	1.8**	1.86***
Lebanon	8.44***	11.25*	11.32**	11.44***

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60. Harvey and Leybourne (2007) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 ve 7.7ir. *,** and*** for %1, %5 ve %10 respectively means that linearity main hypothesis is rejected.

According to the results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 13, it is demonstrated that political globalization has a non-linear structure for all of the countries. Here, we had better use non linear unit root test rather than linear unit root test.

The results of Enders Granger non linear unit root tests held for political globalization are demonstrated at Table 16.

Table 16: Linearity Test Results for Social Globalization

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Israel	0.3471	9	nonconvergence
Iran	1.9009	6	nonconvergence
Iraq	2.6468	8	nonconvergence
Oman	1.9518	8	nonconvergence
Lebanon	0.0493	7	nonconvergence

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for %1, %5 ve %10 are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98 .

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 12, it is seen none of the countries has converged to EU-27 average in terms of political globalization.

Linearity test results for social globalization are demonstrated at Table 17.

Table 17 : Linearity Test Results for Social Globalization

| Countries | Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008) | Harvey-Leybourne (2007) W_{10} | | |
		W_5	W_1	
Iran	4.97***	7.79*	7.85**	7.94***
Syria	25.97***	34.96*	35.13**	35.45***
Turkey	16.93***	46.41*	49.13**	54.37***
UAE	4.8***	9.29*	9.38**	9.54***

Note: Harvey et al. (2008) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 9.21, 5.99 and 4.60. Harvey and Leybourne (2007) test critical values for %1, %5 and %10 are respectively as 13.27, 9.48 and 7.7. *** and*** for 1%, 5% and 10% respectively means that linearity main hypothesis is rejected.

According to the results of Harvey-Leybourne linearity test taking place at Table 17, it is demonstrated that social globalization has a non-linear structure for all of the countries. Unit root test results related to social globalization series take place at table 18.

Table 18: Social Non-linear Unit Root Test for 27 Countries

Countries	Enders Granger	Optimal lag	
Iran	1.5747	7	nonconvergence
Syria	2.7102	7	nonconvergence
Turkey	0.7241	7	nonconvergence
UAE	0.1370	7	nonconvergence

Note: Enders-Granger (1998) test critical values for 1%, 5% and 10% are respectively as 5.79, 3.81, 2.98.

According to the results of Enders Granger non-linear unit root test taking place in Table 18, it is seen that none of the countries has converged to EU-27 average.

7. CONCLUSION

At his study, globalization has been discussed with reference to its economic, social and political dimensions. Enders Granger non-linear unit root test is used in order to determine whether globalization has converged from the perspective of economic, social and political dimensions. It has been determined that Turkey, Jordan and Egypt has converged to EU-9 average from the point of political globalization and Saudi Arabia has converged to EU-9 average from the point of social globalization. When it comes to EU-15 convergence, it has been determined that Iran has converged from the point of economic globalization; Egypt and Jordan from the point of political globalization; and Kuwait and Saudi Arabia from the point of social globalization. And finally, when it comes to EU-27 average, it has been determined that just Kuwait has converged from the point of economic globalization.

REFERENCES

Bernard, A. B., and Durlauf, N. B. (1995). Convergence in International Output. Journal of Applied Econometrics, 10, 97-108.

Bernard, A. B.,and Durlauf, N. B. (1996). Interpreting Tests of the Convergence Hypothesis. Journal of Econometrics, 71, 279-298.

Binder, M. and Pesaran, M.H. (1999). Stochastic Growth Models and Their Econometric Implications. Journal of Economic Growth, 4, 139-183.

Caner, M. and Hansen, B. E. (2001). Threshold Autoregression with a Unit Root. Econometrica, 69(6), s.1555-1596.

Carlino, G. A., and Mills, L. O. (1996). Are U.S. Regional Incomes Converging? A Times Series Analysis. Journal of Monetary Economics, 32, 335-346.

Colas, A. (2008). Neoliberalizm, Küreselleşme ve Uluslararası İlişkiler, Alfredo Saad-Filho ve Deborah Johnston, der., Neoliberalizm: Muhalif Bir Seçki, translation. Şeyda Başlı ve Tuncel Öncel, Yordam Kitap, İstanbul, 2008. ss. 123-139.

Enders, W. and Granger, C.W.J. (1998). Unit-Root Tests and Asymmetric Adjustment with an Example Using the Term Structure of Interest Rates. Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 16(3), 304–311.

Harvey, D.I. and Leybourne, S.J. (2007). Testing for Time Series Linearity. Econometrics Journal, 10, 149-165.

Harvey, D.I., Leybourne, S.J. and Xiao, B. (2008). A Powerful Test for Linearity When the Order of Integration is Unknown. Studies Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics, 12(3) (article 2).

Held, Det al., (1999). "Globalization," Global Governance, 5(4), 483-496.

Held, D. et al. . (1999). Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Culture, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge.

Hirst, Paul and Grahame Thompson (1998), Küreselleşme Sorgulanıyor, translation., Çağla Erdem ve Elif Yücel, Dost Kitabevi, Ankara, 1998.

Ikenberry, G. J. (2007). Globalization as American Hegemony, David Held and Anthony G: Mcgrew, ed. Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies, Polity Press, Cambridge. pp.41-58.

Kiely, R., The Clash of Globalisations: Neo-Liberalism, The Third Way and Anti-Globalisation, Brill, Leiden.

Leybourne, S., Newbold, P. and Vougas, D. (1998). Unit Roots and Smooth Transitions. Journal of Time Series Analysis, 19(1), 83-97

McGrew, Anthony, "Globalization in Hard Times: Contention in the Academy and Beyond," George Ritzer, ed., The Blackwell Companion to Globalizaiton, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, 2008, ss.29-53

Odman, A. E. (2003), "Karşılaştırmalı Ekonomi-Politik: Meksika'da Popülizm ve Türkiye'de Devletçilik", 8.Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi, 3-5 Aralık, Ankara.

Ohmae, K. (1995). The End of the Nation States: The Rise of Regional Economies, Harper Collins, London.

Leo Panitch ve Sam Gindin, "Finance and American Empire," (Edt). Leo Panitch ve Colin Leys, Socialist

Register, s. 46-81.Park, J.Y. and Shintani, M. (2005). Testing for a Unit Root Against Transitional Autoregressive Models, Vanderbilt University Department of Economics Working Papers, No:05-W10

Robertson, R. K.E. White (2007). "What Is Globalization," George Ritzer, ed., The Blackwell Companion to Globalizaiton, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, pp. 54-66.

Robinson, W. I. (2007). "Theories of Globalization," George Ritzer, ed., The Blackwell Companion to Globalizaiton, Blackwell Publishing, Madlen, pp. 125-143.

Savran, S. (2008). Kod Adı Küreselleşme: 21. Yüzyılda Emperyalizm, Yordam Kitap, İstanbul.

Scholte, J. A (2005). Globalization: A Critical Introduction, 2nd edition, Palgrave Publishers, New York.

Strange, S. (2000). "The Declining Authority of States," (Edt). David Held ve Anthony Mcgrew, The Global Transformations Reader, Blackwell Publishers Inc., Madlen. pp.148-155.

Zakaria, Fareed, The Post-American World, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 2008.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Giriş

Bu çalışmada bazı Ortodoğu ülkelerinin küreselleşmenin ekonomik, politik ve sosyal boyutları açısından AB ülkelerine yakınsama durumu ele alınmıştır. Serilerin doğrusal olup olmadığı Harvey-Leybourne (2007) ve Harvey ve Leybourne (2008) doğrusallık testleri ile incelenmiştir. Çalışmadan elde edilen veriler doğrultusunda, Kuveyt'in AB 27 ortalamasına ekonomik küreselleşme ve AB-15 ise sosyal küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı tespit edilmiştir. Suudi Arabistan'ın ise AB-9 ve AB-15 ortalamasına sosyal küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı görülmüştür. Mısır ve Ürdün, hem AB-9 ortalamasına hem de AB-15 ortalamasına politik küreselleşme açısından yakınsamıştır. T Türkiye ise yalnızca AB-9 ortalamasına politik açıdan yakınsamıştır. İran'ın ise yalnızca AB-15 ortalamasına ekonomik küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı sonucuna erişilmiştir. Diğer ülkeler için yakınsama tespit edilmemiştir.

Küreselleşme Kavramsallaştırması

Dünya, 1970'lerde başlayan ve 1990'larda ivme kazanan hızlı bir dönüşüm süreci içerisine girdi. Üretim biçimlerinden tüketim alışkanlıklarına kadar hemen hemen bütün ekonomik, siyasi, toplumsal ve askeri ilişkileri etkileyen bu dönüşüm, "küreselleşme" (globalization) olarak adlandırıldı. Gerek akademik çalışmalarda, gerekse politika yapıcıların söylemlerinde küreselleşme merkezi bir kavrama dönüştü.

Küreselleşmeye ilişkin perspektifler, küreselleşmenin bir süreç mi, yoksa bir proje mi olduğu sorusunu da içermektedir. Dolayısıyla farklı boyutları bulunan bir kavramsallaşmadan söz edilmektedir. Yapılan bir değerlendirmeye göre küreselleşme en az dört boyutu bulunan bir süreç veya süreçler bütünüdür (Held, 1999:484).

1: Toplumsal, siyasal ve ekonomik ilişkilerin siyasal sınırlar, bölgeler ve kıtalar arasında esnemesidir.

2: Ticaret, yatırım, finans, göç ve kültürel akışkanlıkların artmasına paralel olarak karşılıklı bağımlılığın yoğunlaşmasıdır.

3: İletişim ve taşımacılık teknolojilerinin gelişimiyle birlikte fikirlerin, malların, bilginin, sermayenin ve insanların daha hızlı hareket etmesidir.

4: Uzaklıklar arası mesafenin azalması, yerel olayların küresel sonuçlar üretebilmesi ve iç sorunlar ile küresel ilişkilerin giderek daha da belirsizleşmesidir.

3. Küreselleşme Yaklaşımları

Küreselleşmenin nasıl kavramsallaştırılmasına ilişkin yoğun bir literatürün varlığı bilinmektedir. Bu nedenle çalışmamızda küreselleşmenin ne olduğuna (ya da olmadığına) ilişkin bir tartışmaya girilmeyecektir. Üç temel küreselleşme kuramları: Aşırı küreselleşmeci, Şüpheci ve Dönüşümcü yaklaşımlar olarak bilinen teorik perspektiflerin küreselleşme kavramsallaştırmaları incelenmiştir. Şüpheci yaklaşıma göre küreselleşmeyi Batı veya ABD hegemonyasının bir projesi olarak değerlendiren şüpheci yaklaşımlar, süreci ve dinamikleri eleştirel bir perspektiften değerlendiren ve daha Marksist ve Neo-Marksist kuramcılardan oluşmaktadır.

Aşırıcı (Hyper) küreselleşmeciler olarak bilinen ve küreselleşmeyi daha çok ekonomik ve teknolojik determinizm perspektiften değerlendiren bu yaklaşım, küreselleşmeyi neo-liberalleşmeye özdeş gören bir anlayış içerisindedir.

Dönüşümcü yaklaşım savunucuları ise, farklı kuramsal ve metodolojik geleneğe sahip kişilerden oluşur. Aşırı küreselleşmecilerden farklı olarak, küreselleşmeyi salt ekonomik perspektiften okumazlar ve küreselleşmenin çok boyutluluğunu öne çıkarırlar.

4. Literatür Taraması
Feenstra'ya (1998) göre, küreselleşmenin işgücünün ve sermayenin pazarlık güçlerinin değişmesi üzerindeki etkisinin çok önemli sonuçları bulunmaktadır. Ticaretin etkilediği sanayilerde, işçi sendikalarının gücünün zayıflatılmasının (emek piyasasını esnekleştirilmesinin) gelişmiş ülkelerde ücret eşitsizliklerinin artmasında önemli bir katkısı olabilir. Sanayileşmiş ülkelerdeki düşük-nitelikli işçilerin durumunun bozulmasına neden olan faktörler küreselleşme ve yeni teknolojilerdir. Küreselleşme, hem yoğun-bilgi teknolojileriyle üretilen mal ve hizmetlere daha geniş pazarlar yaratmakta hem de niteliksiz işgücü aleyhine olacak teknolojik değişmenin gelişmesine yardım etmektedir.

Edwards (1997), ticaret politikası ve gelir dağılımı arasındaki ilişkiyi, altı farklı ticaret açıklığı göstergesi üzerinden Gini katsayısına etkisini araştırmıştır. Çalışma, ticaretin liberalleşmesinin ya da küreselleşmenin artmasının, gelir eşitsizliği üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olduğunu gösteren hiçbir kanıt bulunmadığı sonucuna varmıştır.

Goldberg ve Pavcnik (2007), Hecksher-Ohlin teorisinin aksine, gelişmekte olan ülkelerde vasıfsız ve vasıfsız işçiler arasındaki genişleyen ücret farkını araştırmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre; küreselleşmeyle artan gelir eşitsizliğinin temel açıklamaları, gelişmekte olan ülkelere sermaye akışının artması ve yetenekli teknolojik değişim içermektedir.

5. Veri ve Metodoloji

Ekonomik, politik, sosyal küreselleşme açısından Bahreyn, Birleşik Arap Emirlikleri, Irak, İran, İsrail, Katar, Kuveyt, Lübnan, Mısır, Suriye, Suudi Arabistan, Türkiye, Umman, Ürdün ve Yemen gibi ülkelerin Avrupa Birliğine (AB) yakınsa durumu araştırılacaktır. Bu ülkelerin AB(9), AB(15) ve AB(27)'ye yakınsaması ayrı ayrı incelenecektir. Analizde kullanılan veriler 1970-2015 yıllarını kapsamaktadır. Zaman serileri analizinde serinin doğrusal olup olmadığını belirlemek için kullanılan doğrusal olmama testleri bulunmaktadır. Bu testlerden Harvey-Leybourne (2007) ve Harvey-Leybourne and Xiao (2008) testleri değişkenler için durağanlığa dikkat etmediği için daha avantajlıdır. Bu nedenle bu çalışmada Harvey-Leybourne doğrusal olmama testleri kullanılmıştır.

6. Uygulama Sonuçları

Uygulama sonuçlarını özetle şöyle ifade edebiliriz: Kuveyt'in AB 27 ortalamasına ekonomik küreselleşme ve AB-15 ise sosyal küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı tespit edilmiştir. Suudi Arabistan'ın ise AB-9 ve AB-15 ortalamasına sosyal küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı görülmüştür. Mısır ve Ürdün, hem AB-9 ortalamasına hem de AB-15 ortalamasına politik küreselleşme açısından yakınsamıştır. T Türkiye ise yalnızca AB-9 ortalamasına politik açıdan yakınsamıştır. İran'ın ise yalnızca AB-15 ortalamasına ekonomik küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı sonucuna erişilmiştir. Diğer ülkeler için yakınsama tespit edilmemiştir.

7. Sonuç

Bu çalışmada küreselleşme kavramı ekonomik, sosyal ve politik açıdan incelenmiştir. Bu kapsamda küreselleşmenin ekonomik, sosyal ve politik açıdan yakınsayıp yakınsamadığının incelenmesi için Enders Granger doğrusal olmayan birim kök testi kullanılmıştır. AB-9 ülke ortalamasına Mısır, Ürdün ve Türkiye'nin politik küreselleşme açısından ve Suudi Arabistan'ın ise sosyal küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı bulgularına erişilmiştir. AB-15 ortalamasına ise, İran'ın ekonomik küreselleşme açısından; Mısır ve Ürdün ise politik küreselleşme açısından ve Kuveyt ile Suudi Arabistan ise sosyal küreselleşme açısından yakınsadığı bulgularına erişilmiştir. AB-27 ülke ortalamasına ise yalnızca Kuveyt'in ekonomik küreselleşme açıdan yakınsadığı tespit edilmiştir.