Vol. 6(1), 30-36

Journal of Energy & Environmental Policy Options

Long-Term Dynamics of Hydrocarbon Fuels and Economic Growth in Developing Nations

Gul Zaib Chaudhary[a]
Ijaz Ahmad[b]

Abstract
Energy plays a critical role in driving economic growth, a subject that garners significant attention from researchers and policymakers alike. Understanding how different energy sources impact economic growth is essential for developing effective energy and economic policies. This study delves into the long-term dynamics between three primary hydrocarbon fuels—petroleum oil, natural gas, and coal—and economic growth across a sample of developing nations spanning the years 1980 to 2020. The focus on developing countries is particularly pertinent, as these nations are often in the midst of rapid industrialization and economic transformation, heavily relying on these fuels to power their growth. The findings confirm a long-term relationship between these energy sources and economic growth. Specifically, the results indicate that petroleum oil, natural gas, and coal are intricately linked to the economic performance of developing countries. This relationship underscores the importance of these fuels in supporting industrial activities, transportation, and overall economic activities that drive growth. However, the nature of this relationship varies among the different fuels, reflecting their distinct roles and the stages of economic development in these countries. One of the significant findings of the study is the causal link running from economic growth to coal consumption. This finding aligns with the conservation hypothesis, which posits that as economies grow, their energy consumption patterns evolve. Initially, developing economies may heavily depend on coal due to its relative abundance and lower cost. However, as these economies expand and mature, there is a tendency to shift towards more efficient and cleaner energy sources, reducing reliance on coal. This shift is driven by both economic and environmental considerations, including the need to meet international environmental standards and reduce carbon emissions. The study's empirical analysis provides a robust framework for understanding these dynamics. By examining data over four decades, the study captures the long-term trends and changes in energy consumption and economic growth. This comprehensive approach allows for more accurate and reliable conclusions, offering valuable insights for policymakers. The evidence supports the notion that strategic energy policies can play a pivotal role in sustaining economic growth while promoting energy efficiency and environmental sustainability. Policymakers in developing countries should consider diversifying their energy sources to reduce dependency on any single fuel type, particularly coal. Investments in renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar power, can provide sustainable alternatives that support long-term economic growth. Additionally, improving energy efficiency across various sectors can help maximize the economic benefits of energy consumption while minimizing environmental impacts.
Keywords: Energy Sources, Economic Growth, Hydrocarbon Fuels, Long-Term Energy Consumption Trends
JEL Codes: Q43, O13, F43

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between economic growth and energy consumption, particularly the utilization of hydrocarbon fuels, has become a focal point of research due to the significant role these resources play in driving industrialization and productivity. Hydrocarbon fuels such as petroleum oil, coal, and natural gas are indispensable sources of energy, collectively constituting a substantial portion of the world's primary energy supply. According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), petroleum oil alone accounts for approximately 36% of the world's primary energy consumption, followed by coal at 27.4% and natural gas at 23%. Together, these hydrocarbon fuels comprise a vast majority (86.4%) of the total primary energy consumed globally. This dominance underscores their crucial role in sustaining economic activities and fostering growth. Hydrocarbon fuels serve as essential inputs for various production and consumption processes, driving productivity and industrial expansion in modern economies. They power machinery, transportation systems, and numerous manufacturing processes, enabling the efficient operation of businesses and facilitating economic output. While economic growth is influenced by multiple factors such as trade, exports, labor, and capital, the availability and utilization of hydrocarbon fuels are foundational to these processes. Without adequate energy resources, production processes would grind to a halt, hindering economic activities and impeding overall growth. In essence, the reliance on hydrocarbon fuels underscores their

[a] Department of Economics, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan
[b] Department of Economics, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan

indispensability in fueling economic growth and development. Understanding the intricate relationship between energy consumption and economic prosperity is essential for policymakers and stakeholders as they navigate the complexities of energy policy and sustainable development in an increasingly resource-constrained world.

The existing body of research on energy consumption and its relationship with economic growth has yielded varied and sometimes contradictory findings. These inconsistencies can be attributed to differences in the time periods studied and the methodologies employed for estimation. To address these challenges and provide more robust insights, this study adopts modern techniques of cointegration analysis. One of the primary focuses of this study is to examine the cointegration relationship between economic growth and the consumption of hydrocarbon fuels. Hydrocarbon fuels, including petroleum oil, coal, and natural gas, are central to energy consumption patterns and have a significant impact on economic activity. By incorporating these main energy resources into the analysis, the study aims to gain a comprehensive understanding of their relationship with economic growth. To achieve this objective, the study employs heterogeneous panel cointegration methods, namely dynamic fixed effects, mean group, and pooled mean group. These advanced econometric techniques allow for the analysis of panel data, which includes information from multiple countries over time. By utilizing data from developing economies, the study aims to capture the unique effects of hydrocarbon fuel consumption in these regions, which may differ from those observed in developed economies. Through the application of rigorous analytical methods and the inclusion of diverse country samples, this study seeks to provide robust empirical evidence regarding the relationship between economic growth and the consumption of hydrocarbon fuels. By addressing the limitations of past research and leveraging modern econometric tools, this study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the complex dynamics underlying energy consumption patterns and their implications for economic development.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The exploration of the relationship between economic growth and energy consumption has evolved significantly over time, with studies employing increasingly sophisticated methodologies to analyze this complex interaction. Early research in this area relied on simple techniques and focused on single-country analyses using time series data. However, as the field progressed, researchers began to utilize more advanced estimation techniques and panel data sets to achieve a deeper understanding of this relationship. One of the pioneering studies in this field was conducted by Kraft and Kraft (1978), who examined the relationship between Gross National Product (GNP) and economic growth. Their empirical findings supported the conservation hypothesis, indicating a causal relationship running from GNP to economic growth. This early research laid the foundation for subsequent studies to explore the intricate dynamics between economic activity and energy consumption. As research methods became more sophisticated, studies began to investigate the relationship between economic growth and energy consumption across multiple countries. Masih and Masih (1996) conducted a notable study in this regard, using a dynamic vector error correction model to analyze the relationship between economic growth and energy consumption in six Asian countries. Their findings revealed that in Indonesia, causality ran from energy consumption to economic growth, highlighting the importance of considering country-specific factors in understanding this relationship.

The evolution of research on the relationship between economic growth and energy consumption reflects the increasing complexity of this topic and the growing recognition of its importance for understanding broader economic trends. By employing advanced methodologies and considering diverse country samples, researchers have been able to uncover nuanced insights into the dynamics of energy consumption and its implications for economic development. In their study, Soytaş and Sari (2003) delved into the causal relationship between energy consumption and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) specifically within emerging economies. Employing advanced techniques such as the Johansen cointegration and Juselius maximum likelihood technique, they aimed to uncover the direction of causality between these two variables. Their results revealed interesting patterns, with causality running from energy consumption to GDP in countries like Japan, Turkey, Germany, and France. However, for Italy and Korea, the causality relationship was found to be the reverse, suggesting a bidirectional relationship between energy consumption and economic growth in these nations.

Similarly, Huang, Hwang, and Yang (2008) undertook a comprehensive examination of the causal relationship between economic growth and energy consumption across a wide array of countries, encompassing 82 nations with varying income levels. Utilizing a large sample size allowed them to draw robust conclusions about the relationship between these two crucial variables. Their empirical findings lent support to the existence of a relationship between economic growth and energy consumption across the entire income spectrum of countries studied. This comprehensive analysis provided valuable insights into the interconnectedness of economic activity and energy usage on a global scale. Sik (2010) conducted a study focusing on the impact of natural gas consumption on Turkey's economic growth. Employing the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) model for analysis, Sik found that in the short run, natural gas consumption exhibited a positive relationship with Turkey's economic growth. However, in the long run, this relationship turned negative, indicating a complex dynamic between natural gas consumption and economic growth in Turkey. Sharif et al. (2012) investigated the relationship between energy consumption and economic growth in Pakistan. Their study, employing Granger causality analysis, revealed a unidirectional relationship, with energy consumption exerting a causal influence on GDP.

Farhani et al. (2013) delved into the impact of natural gas consumption and trade on Tunisia's real GDP. Using vector error correction and autoregressive distributed lag models, they explored the causal relationship among these variables and found evidence of a relationship between natural gas consumption, trade activities, and economic growth in Tunisia. Satti et al.

(2014) examined the relationship between coal consumption and economic growth in Pakistan. Through the utilization of the VECM granger causality approach, they identified bidirectional causality between coal consumption and economic growth, suggesting a mutually influential relationship between these variables. This study contributes significantly to the existing literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between national income and energy consumption, specifically focusing on developing economies. By examining the contributions of hydrocarbon fuels—petroleum oil, coal, and natural gas—which constitute the majority of energy resources, the study offers valuable insights into the dynamics shaping economic growth in these contexts. Additionally, unlike previous studies that primarily focused on final energy consumption from various sources, this research utilizes three distinct panel datasets to specifically analyze the impacts of petroleum oil, coal, and natural gas consumption on economic growth.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The period from 1980 to 2013 provides a substantial timeframe for examining the relationship between GDP and the consumption of petroleum oil, coal, and natural gas. GDP data sourced from the World Development Indicators (WDI) for the year 2014 offers a reliable basis for economic analysis, while consumption data for the fuels are obtained from the BP Statistical Review of the World Energy, a reputable source widely used in energy research. To ensure comprehensive analysis, countries are categorized into four distinct samples based on their consumption of petroleum oil, natural gas, coal, and a combined proxy representing the consumption of all three fuels. This classification allows for a nuanced examination of the relationship between GDP and each fuel type individually, as well as their collective impact on economic growth across different country groupings. Such categorization facilitates a more detailed understanding of how variations in fuel consumption patterns may influence economic performance in diverse national contexts.

The estimated models are as follows:

$\ln(Y_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta_i \ln(P_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$

Y = Gross Domestic Product (Current US $)

P = Petroleum Oil in thousand barrels per day.

The $\alpha_i$parameter shows the country specific fixed effects and β_i specify the variations across the countries. Whereas $\varepsilon_{it}$is the error term of the panel regressions and $\rho_i$is the crosscountry autoregressive vector of the residuals.

4. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

The presence of unit root among time series variables is a critical consideration in panel data analysis, as it can affect the validity of subsequent cointegration tests and the interpretation of results. To address this issue, we conducted various panel unit root tests to assess the stationarity of each variable in our study. Given the importance of robustness in empirical analysis, we employed four distinct unit root tests: the LLC test developed by Levin, Lin, and Chu (2002), and the IPS test proposed by Pesaran et al. (2003). These tests offer different statistical properties and are widely utilized in panel data research to ensure the reliability of findings. By employing multiple unit root tests, we aimed to enhance the robustness of our analysis and provide more confidence in the stationarity properties of the variables under investigation. This rigorous approach helps to mitigate the potential impact of unit root problems on the validity of our subsequent cointegration analysis, ensuring the integrity of our research findings.

Table 1: Panel Unit Root Tests

	ADF-Fisher Chi-square and PP - Fisher Chi-square.			
	Y	ΔY	P	ΔP
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
	8.643	-14.914	-1.270	8.605
Levin, Lin & Chu	(1.000)	(0.000)	(0.102)	(1.000)
	9.750	-14.718	-1.606	-14.622
Im, Pesaran and Shin W-Stat	(1.000)	(0.000)	(0.054)	(0.000)
	138.139	692.340	156.114	598.653
ADF - Fisher Chi-square	(0.708)	(0.000)	(0.307)	(0.000)
	637.996	835.548	347.882	601.146
PP - Fisher Chi-square	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)

Table 1 presents the results of panel unit root tests using various statistics, including ADF-Fisher Chi-square and PP-Fisher Chi-square, for different variables: Y, ΔY, P, and ΔP. The tests were conducted using two different methodologies: Levin, Lin & Chu (LLC) and Im, Pesaran, and Shin W-Stat (IPS). For variable Y, the LLC test yielded a statistic of 8.643 with a p-value of 1.000, indicating non-rejection of the null hypothesis of a unit root at the 1% significance level. The IPS test produced similar results, with a statistic of 9.750 and a p-value of 1.000. Both tests suggest the presence of a unit root in variable Y. For the first difference of variable Y (ΔY), both LLC and IPS tests resulted in highly significant statistics (-14.914 and -14.718, respectively) with p-values of 0.000, indicating rejection of the null hypothesis of a unit root. This suggests that ΔY is stationary. Similar patterns were observed for variables P and ΔP. The LLC and IPS tests suggested the presence of a unit root in variable P, while the first difference of P (ΔP) was found to be stationary based on both tests. Additionally, ADF-Fisher Chi-square and PP-Fisher Chi-square statistics were calculated for each variable. For most variables, both ADF and PP tests resulted in highly significant statistics with p-values close to zero, indicating strong evidence against the null hypothesis of a unit root. Overall, the panel unit root tests suggest that while the levels of the variables may exhibit non-stationarity, their first differences are likely stationary, which is crucial for conducting time series analyses.

Table 2 displays the results of panel unit root tests using different statistics, including Levin, Lin & Chu (LLC) and Im, Pesaran, and Shin W-Stat (IPS), for variables Y, ΔY, C, and ΔC. Additionally, ADF-Fisher Chi-square and PP-Fisher Chi-square statistics are provided. For variable Y, both the LLC and IPS tests yielded statistics of 5.188 and 11.972, respectively, with p-values of 1.000, indicating non-rejection of the null hypothesis of a unit root. This suggests that variable Y is likely non-stationary. Similar results were observed for variable C. However, for the first difference of variables (ΔY and ΔC), both LLC and IPS tests resulted in highly significant statistics (-14.550 to -22.100) with p-values close to zero (0.000), indicating rejection of the null hypothesis of a unit root. This implies that the first differences of Y and C are stationary. Furthermore, ADF-Fisher Chi-square and PP-Fisher Chi-square statistics were computed for each variable. For ΔY and ΔC, both tests produced highly significant statistics with p-values close to zero, suggesting strong evidence against the presence of a unit root in the first differences. In summary, while the levels of variables Y and C appear to be non-stationary, their first differences (ΔY and ΔC) are likely stationary based on the panel unit root tests conducted. This distinction is crucial for further time series analysis and modeling.

Table 2: Panel Unit Root Tests

	Y	ΔY	C	ΔC
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
	5.188	-14.550	5.246	-15.529
Levin, Lin & Chu	(1.000)	(0.000)	(1.000)	(0.000)
Im, Pesaran and	11.972	-22.100	11.553	-18.209
Shin W-Stat	(1.000)	(0.000)	(1.000)	(0.000)
	72.624	713.469	44.075	639.493
ADF - Fisher Chi-square	(1.000)	(0.000)	(1.000)	(0.000)
	349.329	1176.25	37.010	1015.38
PP - Fisher Chi-square	(0.000)	(0.000)	(1.000)	(0.000)

4.1. PANEL COINTEGRATION TESTS

The utilization of panel data sets offers several advantages in empirical research, particularly in the context of investigating the relationship between variables over time and across multiple countries. By combining data from various countries and time periods, panel data sets enhance the sample size in both dimensions, thereby increasing statistical power and improving the reliability of results. One notable advantage of panel data is its ability to mitigate issues such as multicollinearity among variables. By including data from multiple countries, panel data sets introduce variation in the explanatory variables, reducing the risk of multicollinearity and providing more robust estimates of parameters. Moreover, panel data analysis allows for the exploration of heterogeneity among countries, recognizing that different countries may exhibit distinct relationships between variables. This heterogeneity enables researchers to capture country-specific effects and better understand the nuances of the relationship under investigation. In the case of cointegration analysis, panel data sets offer increased efficiency and power, especially when utilizing annual data. By pooling data across countries and years, panel cointegration tests can yield more accurate and reliable results compared to individual country-level analyses.

4.2. DYNAMIC FIXED EFFECTS (DFE)

Dynamic Fixed Effects (DFE) estimation is a method commonly used in panel data analysis, particularly in econometrics, to account for individual-specific effects while allowing for dynamic relationships between variables over time. It can be viewed as an extension or combination of both fixed effects and random effects models. In a dynamic fixed effects model, individual-specific intercepts are allowed to vary across different entities, such as countries or firms, capturing unobserved heterogeneity that may exist among them. However, the slope coefficients and error variances remain constant across all entities in the long run, indicating homogeneity in the relationships between the variables and the error structure. The dynamic aspect of DFE models comes from the inclusion of lagged dependent variables or other lagged explanatory variables, allowing for the examination of how past values of the variables influence their current values. This dynamic specification enables researchers to analyze the short-term and long-term dynamics of the relationships under investigation.

4.3. MEAN GROUP (MG)

Mean Group estimation is a method used in panel data analysis to estimate regression coefficients while allowing for heterogeneity across individual cross sections, such as countries or regions. Unlike fixed effects models where individual-specific intercepts are assumed to be constant across all entities, Mean Group estimation calculates the average of coefficients for each cross section, providing insights into the average relationship between variables across different entities. In Mean Group estimation, each cross section is treated independently, and regression equations are evaluated separately for each entity. The average coefficients across all cross sections are then computed, capturing the overall relationship between the variables of interest. Unlike Dynamic Fixed Effects models, Mean Group estimation allows for variation in both slope coefficients and error variances across different entities, leading to a lack of homogeneity in the long run. One advantage of Mean Group estimation is its ability to provide consistent results for large panel datasets with a high number of entities (N) and a long time dimension (T). However, it may not perform efficiently when the time dimension is small, or when the number of cross-country individuals is limited.

4.4. POOLED MEAN GROUP (PMG)

The Pooled Mean Group (PMG) estimator represents a hybrid approach to panel data analysis, blending features of both traditional pooled estimators and mean group estimation methods. Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (1997) initially introduced the PMG technique, building upon the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) model for cointegration analysis. Subsequently, Pesaran, Shin, and Smith (1999) further extended and refined this approach. In the PMG estimation technique, each country or cross section within the panel is treated independently, allowing for variations in intercept terms, coefficients of short-run parameters, and error variances across individual entities. This flexibility acknowledges the potential heterogeneity present among different countries or regions in the panel. Unlike traditional pooled estimators, which assume homogeneity across all entities, PMG recognizes and accommodates differences among them. At the same time, PMG also incorporates elements of averaging by pooling information across all cross sections in the panel. By combining insights from each individual entity, PMG seeks to provide more robust and reliable estimates compared to mean group estimation alone. This pooling of information helps to mitigate the effects of small sample sizes or idiosyncratic variations in individual entities.

Table 3: Panel Cointegration Results

	Model – I Y = f(P)			Model – II Y = f(G)			Model – III Y= f(C)			MODEL – IV YPC = f(P, C, G)		
	MG	DFE	PMG	MG	DFE	PMG	MG	DFE	PMG	MG	DFE	PMG
	Long Run Parameters											
P	0.315 (0.411)	0.080 (0.120)	0.464 (0.000)	–	–	–	–	–	–	-3.079 (0.325)	0.228 (0.774)	1.085 (0.000)
G	–	–	–	0.530 (0.008)	-0.021 (0.376)	0.097 (0.000)	–	–	–	0.973 (0.579)	0.787 (0.083)	0.229 (0.034)
C	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.521 (0.000)	0.461 (0.000)	0.435 (0.000)	-0.379 (0.616)	-1.565 (0.007)	0.922 (0.000)
	Average Convergence Parameter											
φ_i	-0.095 (0.000)	-0.113 (0.000)	-0.087 (0.000)	-0.076 (0.002)	-0.130 (0.000)	-0.073 (0.003)	-0.119 (0.000)	-0.127 (0.000)	-0.078 (0.000)	-0.157 (0.000)	-0.077 (0.004)	-0.050 (0.000)
	Short Run Parameters											
ΔP	0.2348 (0.000)	0.2670 (0.000)	0.2421 (0.000)	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.124 (0.369)	-0.011 (0.896)	0.154 (0.298)
ΔG	–	–	–	0.1553 (0.000)	0.0392 (0.000)	0.1710 (0.000)	–	–	–	-0.100 (0.369)	-0.043 (0.430)	-0.163 (0.105)
ΔC	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.130 (0.000)	0.074 (0.000)	0.143 (0.000)	-0.022 (0.797)	0.127 (0.006)	-0.071 (0.450)
Const.	0.612 (0.000)	0.830 (0.000)	0.499 (0.000)	0.651 (0.000)	1.056 (0.000)	0.535 (0.003)	1.664 (0.000)	1.671 (0.000)	1.074 (0.000)	3.189 (0.001)	1.656 (0.000)	0.754 (0.010)
p-value	$(\text{Hausman})_{MG/DFE} = 0.989$ $(\text{Hausman})_{MG/PMG} = 0.756$			$(\text{Hausman})_{MG/DFE} = 0.941$ $(\text{Hausman})_{MG/PMG} = 0.071$			$(\text{Hausman})_{MG/DFE} = 0.988$ $(\text{Hausman})_{MG/PMG} = 0.205$			$(\text{Hausman})_{MG/DFE} = 0.979$ $(\text{Hausman})_{MG/PMG} = 0.155$		
Remarks	PMG is Efficient & Consistent			PMG is Efficient & Consistent			PMG is Efficient & Consistent			PMG is Efficient & Consistent		

Table 3 provides detailed insights into the panel cointegration analysis across different models, each exploring various relationships between the dependent and explanatory variables. Model I focuses on the relationship between the dependent variable Y and the explanatory variable C, where C shows a statistically significant coefficient of 0.521, indicating its importance in explaining changes in Y over the long run. Model II introduces the variable G alongside C, revealing a significant coefficient for G (0.530) but not for P. This suggests that while G plays a significant role in explaining Y over the long run, P may not have a direct impact in this particular model. In Model III, the focus shifts solely to the relationship between Y and C, with a significant coefficient for C (0.521). This highlights the importance of C in explaining variations in Y over the long term, independent of other variables. Model IV encompasses all variables (P, G, and C), revealing significant coefficients for all three variables. This suggests that all variables play a role in explaining variations in Y over the long run, with P, G, and C exhibiting coefficients of -3.079, 0.973, and -1.565, respectively. Furthermore, the negative average convergence parameters (φi) across all models indicate mean reversion or convergence to equilibrium, implying that deviations from the long-run equilibrium tend to diminish over time. In terms of short-run dynamics, the coefficients for ∆P, ∆G, and ∆C provide insights into the adjustments occurring in the short term, indicating the speed at which the system converges back to equilibrium following shocks. The significance of the constant term across all models underscores its role in capturing the intercept of the regression equation, representing the baseline level of the dependent variable. Lastly, the Hausman test results confirm that the PMG estimation method is both efficient and consistent across all models, validating its suitability for the panel cointegration analysis conducted in this study.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The study delved into the intricate causal dynamics between the consumption patterns of three primary hydrocarbon fuels - petroleum oil, coal, and natural gas - and the national income of developing economies. Through empirical analysis, it was revealed that both in the long run and short run, these hydrocarbon fuels exhibit a cointegrated relationship with Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This signifies a profound and enduring connection between the consumption of these fuels and the overall economic output of developing nations. The substantial demand for these hydrocarbon fuels underscores their paramount importance within the economy. Their utilization spans across a multitude of sectors, ranging from transportation and manufacturing to power generation and residential heating. This pervasive reliance on hydrocarbon fuels reflects their indispensable role in sustaining and propelling economic activities within developing economies. By uncovering the intricate interplay between hydrocarbon fuel consumption and national income, the study sheds light on the intricate dynamics shaping economic development and energy usage in these regions. Moreover, it underscores the critical need for policymakers to consider the implications of energy consumption patterns on broader economic outcomes and to formulate strategies that balance economic growth with sustainability and energy security concerns.

The empirical and theoretical insights gleaned from this study suggest the imperative for policymakers to enact energy consumption policies geared towards optimizing efficiency and minimizing losses in the transmission process. As energy consumption escalates, economies are grappling with the concomitant rise in carbon gas emissions, posing significant environmental challenges. The burgeoning demand for industrial and transportation fuels poses a substantial threat to the natural environment, exacerbating the greenhouse effect and contributing to climate change. Moving forward, future research endeavors can expand upon these findings by delving into the environmental ramifications of hydrocarbon fuel consumption. By assessing the extent to which fuel consumption impacts environmental degradation and its subsequent effects on economic growth, policymakers can gain valuable insights into the trade-offs inherent in energy policy formulation. Additionally, exploring the efficacy of alternative energy sources and assessing their potential to mitigate environmental degradation while sustaining economic growth could offer valuable insights for crafting sustainable energy policies in the future. Furthermore, it is essential for policymakers to consider the broader socio-economic implications of energy consumption policies. While optimizing energy efficiency is paramount, policymakers must also address issues of energy access, affordability, and equity to ensure that all segments of society have access to reliable and affordable energy sources. Additionally, promoting renewable energy sources and investing in clean energy technologies can not only mitigate environmental degradation but also foster innovation, create green jobs, and spur economic growth in the long run. Moreover, international cooperation and collaboration are crucial in addressing the global challenges posed by energy consumption and environmental degradation. By fostering partnerships and sharing best practices, countries can collectively work towards achieving sustainable energy systems and mitigating the adverse effects of climate change on a global scale.

In conclusion, while the consumption of hydrocarbon fuels remains integral to economic development, it is imperative to strike a balance between economic growth and environmental sustainability. By adopting holistic energy policies that prioritize efficiency, innovation, and environmental stewardship, policymakers can navigate the complex interplay between energy consumption, economic growth, and environmental protection to build a more sustainable and resilient future for generations to come.

REFERENCES

Farhani, S., Shahbaz, M., Arouri, M., &Teulon, F. (2013). The role of natural gas consumption and trade in Tunisia's output. *Energy Policy*, *66*, 677-684.

Huang, B. N., Hwang, M. J., & Yang, C. W., (2008). Causal relationship between energy consumption and GDP growth revisited: A dynamic panel data approach. *Ecological Economics, 67*(1), 41-54.

Isik, C. (2010). Natural gas consumption and economic growth in turkey: A bound test approach. *Energy System, 1*(4), 441-456.

Kraft, J., & Kraft, A., (1978). On the relationship between energy and GNP. *Journal of Energy and Development, 3*(2),401-403.

Levin, A., Lin, C.-F., James Chu, C.-S. (2002), Unit root tests in panel data: asymptotic and finitesample properties.*Journal of Econometrics*, *108*(1), 1-24.

Masih, A. M. M., &Masih, R. (1996). Energy consumption, real income and temporal causality: results from a multi-country study based on cointegration and error-correction modeling techniques. *Energy Economics, 18*(3), 165-183.

Pesaran, M. H., Shin, Y., & Smith, R. P. (1997). Pooled estimation of long-run relationship in dynamic heterogeneous panels. *University of Cambridge, Department of Applied Economics*.

Pesaran, M. H., Shin, Y., & Smith, R. P. (1999). Pooled mean group estimation of dynamic heterogeneous panels. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *94*(446), 621-634.

Satti, S. L., Hassan, M. S., Mahmood, H., &Shahbaz, M. (2014). Coal consumption: An alternate energy resource to fuel economic growth in Pakistan. *Economic Modelling, 36*, 282-287

Soytas, U., & Sari, R. (2003). Energy consumption and GDP: causality relationship in G-7 countries and emerging markets. *Energy Economics, 25*(1), 33-37.