

Do Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth Affect Poverty, Income Inequality and Economic Development?

Jeanel Dominique M. Bonito
University of Santo Tomas

Felbien Joenes A. Daantos*
University of Santo Tomas

Jesi Catherine A. Mateo
University of Santo Tomas

Marie Antoinette L. Rosete, M.D.E.
University of Santo Tomas

— *Review of* —
**Integrative
Business &
Economics**
— *Research* —

ABSTRACT

The Philippines encountered problems concerning reduction of poverty, filling gaps between income inequalities and achieving economic development. From these ideas, the big question to ask was: “What can be the solution?” Furthermore, entrepreneurship and economic growth had an increasing pattern. Hence, the researchers examined the impact of entrepreneurship and economic growth on poverty, income inequality and economic development. This study used regional data to obtain sufficient number of observations, obtained from official government documents. The regression models followed that of Yanya et al. (2013) which incorporated the theoretical model of Beck et al. (2005) by running regression on cross sectional data and applied a standard Hausman test to choose between Fixed Effects and Random Effects which examined the magnitude and the effects of each explanatory variable to the dependent variables. The results suggested that economic growth plays a vital role on poverty, income inequality and economic development; entrepreneurship has impact on economic development but little or no impact on poverty and income inequality in the Philippines.

Keywords: entrepreneurship, poverty, income inequality, economic development

1.1 BACKGROUND/ OBJECTIVES AND GOALS

The events that occurred in poverty, income inequality and economic development in the Philippines led to a question of “Do entrepreneurship and economic growth affect poverty, income inequality and economic development?” which generated the main objective of the researchers – to examine the impact of entrepreneurship, measured by the number of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, and economic growth, measured by regional gross domestic product, on poverty, income inequality and economic development in the Philippines.

1.2 METHOD

To evaluate the relationship of entrepreneurship and economic growth with poverty, income inequality and economic development, the researchers followed the method used by Yanya et al. (2013) which incorporated the theoretical model of Beck et al. (2005) replacing the income quintile of the poor to human development index and instead of using gross provincial product (GPP), the regional gross domestic product (RGDP) was employed.

To measure the dependent variables, the researchers used the headcount ratio, gini coefficient and human development index; the independent variables were represented by the number of establishments comprising of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) and regional gross domestic product (RGDP). Due to every three-year release of data for poverty, income inequality and economic development, the researchers used regional data to obtain sufficient number of observations to avoid bias and non-normality distribution of data. Furthermore, the researchers acknowledge that the number of MSMEs does not fully represent the definition of entrepreneurship. However, it could be the nearest approximation for entrepreneurship.

In addition, this paper used regional panel data during the specific points of time from 1997 to 2012 (96 observations) to run a multiple regression. The researchers applied a standard Hausman test to choose between Fixed Effects and Random Effects that would examine the magnitude and the effects of each explanatory variable to the dependent variables.

1.3 ECONOMETRIC MODELS

1.3.1 To evaluate the relationship of entrepreneurship and economic growth on poverty, the researchers regressed the following equation:

$$HCR_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(RGDP_{i,t}) + \beta_2 \log(MSMEs_{i,t}) + c_i + u_{it}$$

where:

$HCR_{i,t}$	=	Headcount Ratio
$RGDP_{i,t}$	=	Regional Gross Domestic Product
$MSMES_{i,t}$	=	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
u_{it}	=	the idiosyncratic error with mean 0
c_i	=	the unobserved time constant characteristics of an individual which is the effect the researchers specifically want to control in the panel data model

1.3.2 To evaluate the relationship of entrepreneurship and economic growth on income inequality, the researchers regressed the following equation:

$$GC_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(RGDP_{i,t}) + \beta_2 \log(MSMES_{i,t}) + c_i + u_{it}$$

where:

$GC_{i,t}$	=	Gini Coefficient Ratio
$RGDP_{i,t}$	=	Regional Gross Domestic Product
$MSMES_{i,t}$	=	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
u_{it}	=	the idiosyncratic error with mean 0

c_i = the unobserved time constant characteristics of an individual which is the effect the researchers specifically want to control in the panel data model

1.3.3 To evaluate the relationship of entrepreneurship and economic growth on economic development, the researchers regressed the following equation:

$$HDI_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(RGDP_{i,t}) + \beta_2 \log(MSMES_{i,t}) + c_i + u_{it}$$

where:

$HDI_{i,t}$ = Human Development Index
 $RGDP_{i,t}$ = Regional Gross Domestic Product
 $MSMES_{i,t}$ = Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
 u_{it} = the idiosyncratic error with mean 0
 c_i = the unobserved time constant characteristics of an individual which is the effect the researchers specifically want to control in the panel data model

1.4 RESULT

1.4.1 Poverty Results

The regression results showed that the regional gross domestic product (LOG(RGDP)) (0.0000) was a significant determinant of the poverty at 10% level of significance. While the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (LOG(MSMES)) was an insignificant determinant of poverty at 10% level of significance. A zero (0) F-statistic proved that the model is significant at 10% level of significance. The value for R-squared was 0.907378, which meant that 90.74% of the changes in the headcount ratio could be explained by the changes in the regional gross domestic product. This was a clear indication that the RGDP was a significant determinant of poverty. It also showed that the said variable was negatively related to poverty.

1.4.2 Income Inequality Results

The regression results showed that one of the independent variables, the regional gross domestic product (LOG(RGDP)) (0.1000) was a significant determinant of the income inequality at 10% level of significance. However, the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (LOG(MSMES)) was an insignificant determinant of income inequality at 10% level of significance. A zero (0) F-statistic proved that the model was significant at 10% level of significance. The value for R-squared was 0.931336, which meant that 93.13% of the changes in the gini coefficient could be explained by the changes in the regional gross domestic product. This was a clear indication that the RGDP was a significant determinant of income inequality. It also showed that the said variable was negatively related to income inequality.

1.4.3 Economic Development Results

The regression results showed that two of the independent variables, the regional gross domestic product (LOG(RGDP) (0.0005)) and the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (LOG(MSMES) (0.0458)) were significant determinants of the economic development at 10% level of significance. A zero (0) F-statistic proved that the model was significant at 10% level of significance. The value for R-squared was 0.702508, which meant that 70.25% of the changes in the human development index could be explained by the changes in the regional gross domestic product and the changes in the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises. This was a clear indication that the regional gross domestic product and the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises were significant determinants of the human development index. It also showed that both variables were positively related to each other.

The results from the regression analysis showed that there was a negative relationships between economic growth, and poverty and income inequality. It entailed that a percent (1%) increase of RGDP accounted to poverty could lead to a decrease of 3.3646 and a decrease of 0.0071 to income inequality. Whereas, the analysis revealed that there was a positive relationship between the economic growth and the economic development. It meant that a percent (1%) increase of RGDP accounted to economic development could lead to an increase of 0.0258. Moreover, there was a positive relationship between the entrepreneurship and economic development. Hence, a percent (1%) increase of MSMEs accounted to the human development index could lead to an increase of 0.0906.

The researchers take these results as evidence that economic growth plays a vital role on poverty, income inequality and economic development; entrepreneurship has impact on economic development but little or no impact on poverty and income inequality in the Philippines.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Hausman Test for Poverty

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test			
Equation: Untitled			
Test cross-section random effects			
Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section random	5.65314	2	0.0592

Table 2: Hausman Test for Income Inequality

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test			
Equation: Untitled			
Test cross-section random effects			
Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section random	18.009626	6	0.0062

Table 3: Hausman Test for Economic Development

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test			
Equation: Untitled			
Test cross-section random effects			
Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section random	18.009626	6	0.0062

Table 4: Regression Result for Poverty

Dependent Variable: HCR				
Method: Panel Least Squares				
Date: 09/27/15 Time: 10:55				
Sample (adjusted): 1997 2012				
Periods included: 6				
Cross-sections included: 18				
Total panel (unbalanced) observations: 96				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	80.88851	47.32678	1.709149	0.0915
LOG(RGDP)	-3.364639	0.725987	-4.634574	0.0000
LOG(MSMES)	-0.892350	4.63857	-0.192376	0.8480
Effects Specification				
Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)				
R-squared	0.907378	Mean dependent var		38.95521
Adjusted R-squared	0.884223	S.D. dependent var		13.51954
S.E. of regression	4.600164	Akaike info criterion		6.073113
Sum squared resid	1608.275	Schwarz criterion		6.607352
Log likelihood	-271.5094	Hannan-Quinn criter.		6.289061
F-statistic	39.18644	Durbin-Watson stat		1.762473
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Table 5: Regression Result for Income Inequality

Dependent Variable: GC				
Method: Panel Least Squares				
Date: 11/11/15 Time: 22:45				
Sample (adjusted): 2003 2012				
Periods included: 4				
Cross-sections included: 16				
Total panel (unbalanced) observations: 60				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	1.370907	0.722709	1.896901	0.0655
LOG(RGDP)	-0.007112	0.004219	-1.68573	0.1000
LOG(MSMES)	-0.033467	0.034835	-0.960737	0.3428
Effects Specification				
Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)				
R-squared	0.931336	Mean dependent var	0.431629	
Adjusted R-squared	0.893391	S.D. dependent var	0.042975	
S.E. of regression	0.014032	Akaike info criterion	-5.418398	
Sum squared resid	0.007482	Schwarz criterion	-4.650472	
Log likelihood	184.5519	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-5.118020	
F-statistic	24.54390	Durbin-Watson stat	2.443298	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Table 6: Regression Result for Economic Development

Dependent Variable: HDI				
Method: Panel EGLS (Cross-section random effects)				
Date: 11/11/15 Time: 22:55				
Sample (adjusted): 2006 2012				
Periods included: 3				
Cross-sections included: 16				
Total panel (unbalanced) observations: 44				
Swamy and Arora estimator of component variances				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-1.459571	0.391664	-3.726588	0.0007
LOG(RGDP)	0.025778	0.006676	3.861062	0.0005
LOG(MSMES)	0.090646	0.043765	2.071221	0.0458
Effects Specification				
			S.D.	Rho
Cross-section random			0.088851	0.9617
Idiosyncratic random			0.017743	0.0383
Weighted Statistics				
R-squared	0.702508	Mean dependent var		0.066549
Adjusted R-squared	0.634510	S.D. dependent var		0.030397
S.E. of regression	0.017378	Sum squared resid		0.010570
F-statistic	10.33128	Durbin-Watson stat		1.579044
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			
Unweighted Statistics				
R-squared	0.766968	Mean dependent var		0.562683
Sum squared resid	0.254809	Durbin-Watson stat		0.06550

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the University of Santo Tomas – College of Commerce and Business Administration with the Department of Business Economics. The researchers would like to show their deepest gratitude to Asst. Prof. Marie Antoinette L. Rosete, M.D.E. who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted this research. The researchers would like to acknowledge Miguel de Benavides Library and National Statistics Office: Industry and Trade Statistics Department for assistance with data needed for this study; Assoc. Prof. Cristina Castro–Cabral Ph.D. and Mr. Paolo Kris Adriano for the comments on earlier version of the manuscript that greatly improved the course of this research.

The researchers acknowledge the responsibility for any errors present in this paper and should not cause damage to the reputations of the aforementioned revered individuals.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdullahi, S.A. (2012), “Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth: An Analysis of Impact of Public Policy On Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria”. *International Journal of Business and Social Research (IJBSR)*, Volume 2: (2).
- [2] Acs, Z.J., Desai S., and Hessels J. (2008), “Entrepreneurship, Economic Development and Institutions”. *Small Bus Econ*, 31:219–234.
- [3] Adams Jr., R. (2004), “Economic Growth, Inequality and Poverty: Estimating the Growth Elasticity of Poverty”. *World Development*, Vol. 32, No. 12: 1989–2014.
- [4] Adenutsi, D.E. (2009), “Entrepreneurship, job creation, income empowerment and poverty reduction in low-income economies”.
- [5] Afolabi, M.O. (2013), “Growth effect of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) Financing in Nigeria”. *Journal of African Macroeconomic Review*, Vol. 3, No. 1.
- [6] Agbeibor Jr., W. (2006), “Pro-poor economic growth: Role of small and medium sized enterprises”. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 17: 35–40.
- [7] Ahmad, K. and Riaz, A. (2011), “An Econometric Model Of Poverty In Pakistan: Ardl Approach To Co-Integration”. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, Vol. 1 No. 3: 75-84.
- [8] Ahmed, U.A. and Abraham, T.W. (2011), “Economic Growth and Human Development Index in Nigeria: An Error Correction Model Approach”. *International Journal of Administration and Development Studies, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria*, Vol. 2. No. 1: 239 – 254.
- [9] Akhuemonkhan, I. A, Raimi, L and Sofoluwe, A. O. (2013), “Entrepreneurship Education and Employment Stimulation in Nigeria”. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, Volume 3 Number 1: 55-79.
- [10] Akinlo, A. and Bowale, K. (2012), “Determinants of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) Performance and Poverty Alleviation in Developing Countries: Evidence from South-West Nigeria”. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 17 No.1.
- [11] Akita, T. and Pagulayan, M.S. (2013), “Structural Changes and Interregional Income Inequality in the Philippines, 1975-2009”. *Economics & Management Series*.
- [12] Ali, S., Rashid, H. and Khan, M.A. (2014), “The role of small and medium enterprises and poverty in Pakistan: An empirical analysis”. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, Volume XXI No. 4(593): 67-80.
- [13] Ali, Y.S. and Anshur, J. (2012), “Entrepreneurship Contribution to Economic Growth: An Empirical Study on Benadir Region”. *International Journal of Business and Management Tomorrow*, Vol. 2 No. 9.
- [14] Ali, Y.S. and Ali, A.H. (2013), “Entrepreneurship Development and Poverty Reduction: Empirical Survey from Somalia”. *American International Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 2 No. 3.
- [15] Amaghous, J. and Ibourk, A. (2013), “Entrepreneurial Activities, Innovation and Economic Growth: The Roles of Cyclical Factors. Evidence from OECD Countries for the period 2001-2009”. *International Business Research*, Vol. 6 No. 1.
- [16] Aponno, E.H., Aunalal, Z.I. and Louhenapessy, W.G. (2014), “Influence Of Macroeconomic Indicators Against Poverty Rate In Moluccas Province”.
- [17] Beck, T., Demirguc-Kunt, A. and Levine, R. (2005), “SMEs, Growth, and Poverty: Cross Country Evidence”. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 10: 199–229.

- [18] Berkowitz, D. and Jackson J.E. (2006), "Entrepreneurship and the evolution of income distributions in Poland and Russia". *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Volume 34 (2): 338–356.
- [19] Bruton, G.D., Ketchen Jr, D. and Ireland R. (2013), "Entrepreneurship as a solution to poverty". *Journal of Business Venturing*, 683–689.
- [20] Cagetti, M and De Nardi, M (2006), "Entrepreneurship, Frictions, and Wealth". *Journal of Political Economy*, 2006, Vol. 114 No. 5.
- [21] Castañeda, A., Diaz-Gimenez, J. and Rull, J.V. (2003), "Accounting for the U.S. Earnings and Wealth Inequality".
- [22] Cheema. A. R. and Sial, M. (2012), "Poverty, Income Inequality, and Growth in Pakistan: A Pooled Regression Analysis". *The Lahore Journal of Economics*, 17 (2): 137–157.
- [23] Chowdhury, F., Desai, S., Audretsch, D. and Belitski, M. (2015), "Entrepreneurship, Corruption and Income Inequality".
- [24] Chiu, C.L. and Cabanda, E.C. (2005), "The Role of Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries in Recognition of the Philippine MSME Sector". *Silicon Valley Review of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, Volume 1: 34-43.
- [25] Deb, S. (2015), "Gap between GDP and HDI: Are the Rich Country Experiences Different from the Poor?".
- [26] Forgha, N.G. (2006), "Econometric Model of Poverty in Cameroon: A System Estimation Approach". *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 2 No. 2: 30-46.
- [27] Fritsch, M. and Mueller, P. (2008), "Effects of New Business Formation on Regional Development over Time". *Small Bus Econ*, 30:15–29.
- [28] Gorica, K. and Gumeni, A. (2013), "Towards Sustainable Development. Relationship between HDI and GDP per capita in Albania". *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, Volume 4 (12): 776-780.
- [29] Gentry, W and Hubbard, R.G. (2004), "Entrepreneurship and Household Saving". *Advances in Economic Analysis & Policy*, Vol. 4 No. 1.
- [30] Georgiou PhD, M. (2009), "Entrepreneurship and Human Development Index, a Panel Data Analysis for Western Europe, Japan and the United States (1980 – 2006)".
- [31] Georgiou PhD, M. (2009), "Entrepreneurship Reduces Income Inequality".
- [32] Hossain, M. I. (2013), "An empirical investigation of the impact of foreign remittances on poverty in developing countries".
- [33] Hussain, M.D., Bhuiyan, A.B. and Bakar, R. (2014), "Entrepreneurship Development And Poverty Alleviation: An Empirical Review". *Journal of Asian Scientific Research*, 4(10): 558-573.
- [34] Ilemona, A. and Akoji, O. (2013), "Alleviating Poverty through the use of Entrepreneurship Skill Acquisition in Kogi State, Nigeria". *International Open Journal of Economics*, Vol. 1 No. 2: 14-23.
- [35] Kareem, R.O (2015), "Impact of Entrepreneurship on Poverty Alleviation". *Journal of Business Administration and Education*, Volume 7, Number 1: 1-16.
- [36] Kefi, M.H. and Zouhaier, H. (2013), "Inequality and Economic Growth". *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 2(8): 1013-1025.
- [37] Kimhi, A. (2010), Entrepreneurship and income inequality in Southern Ethiopia. *Small Bus. Econ*, 34: 81-91.

- [38] Kolawole, B.O. (2015), "Poverty, Inequality and Rising Growth in Nigeria: Further Empirical Evidence". *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, Vol. 7 No. 2.
- [39] Lloyd-Ellis, H. and Bernhardt, D. (2000), "Enterprise, Inequality and Economic Development". *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 67 No. 1.
- [40] Li, H., Yang, Z., Yao, X., Zhang, H. and Zhang, J. (2012), "Entrepreneurship, Private economy and Growth: Evidence from China". *China Economic Review*, Volume 23 (4): 948–961.
- [41] Mandarang, I. and Habito, C. (2006), Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Philippine Report 2006-2007.
- [42] Meh, C.A (2005), "Entrepreneurship, wealth inequality, and taxation". *Review of Economic Dynamics*, Volume 8: 688–719.
- [43] Mehrara, M. and Mohammadian, M. (2015), "Does Economic Growth Reduce Income Inequality In Iran? WALIS Approach". *International Letters of Social And Humanistic Sciences*, Vol 45: 73-78.
- [44] Mukras, M. (2003), "Poverty Reduction through Strengthening Small and Medium Enterprises". *Botswana Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 17 No.2: 58-69.
- [45] Pourmohammadi, M., Valibeigi, M. and Sadrmousavi, M. (2014), "The Relationship between HDI and its indicators with regional growth in Iranian Provinces". *Regional Science Inquiry*, Vol. VI, (2): 73-86.
- [46] Quadrini, V (2000), "Entrepreneurship, Saving and Social Mobility". *Review of Economic Dynamics*, Volume 3 (1): 1–40.
- [47] Quadrini, V (1999), "The Importance of Entrepreneurship for Wealth Concentration and Mobility". *Review of Income and Wealth Series*, Volume 45 (1).
- [48] Raghav, G. (2013), Credit, Microfinance and Empowerment.
- [49] Rapoport, H. (2002), "Migration, credit constraints and self-employment: A simple model of occupational choice, inequality and growth". *Economics Bulletin*, Vol. 15 (7): 1-5.
- [50] Risso, W.A. (2013), "Economic growth and income distribution in Mexico". *Economic Modelling*, Volume 35: 708–714.
- [51] Sabir, H. M. and Tahir, S.H. (2012), "The Impact of Different Macroeconomic Variables on Poverty in Pakistan". *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, Vol. 3 No. 10: 788-799.
- [52] Shahbaz, M., Iqbal, A. and Butt, M.S. (2011), "Testing causality between human development and economic growth: a panel data approach". *Int. J. of Education Economics and Development*, Vol.2 No.1: 90 – 102.
- [53] Stel, A.V., Carree, M. and Thurik, R. (2005), "The Effect of Entrepreneurial Activity on National Economic Growth". *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 24 No. 3: 311-321.
- [54] Stel, A.V. and Storey, D. (2004), "The Link between Firm Births and Job Creation: Is there a Upas Tree Effect?" *Regional Studies*, Vol. 38.8, 893–909.
- [55] Son, H. (2008), "The role of labor market in explaining growth and inequality in income: the Philippines' case". *The Philippine review of economics: a joint publication of the University of the Philippines, School of Economics and the Philippine Economic Society*, Vol. 45 (1): 69-92.

- [56] Tahir, S.H., Perveen, N., Ismail, A. and Sabir H. (2014), "Impact of GDP Growth Rate on Poverty of Pakistan: A quantitative Approach". *Euro-Asian Journal of Economics and Finance*, Volume 2 (2): 119-126.
- [57] Thirtle, C., Lin, L. and Piesse, J. (2003), "The Impact of Research-Led Agricultural Productivity Growth on Poverty Reduction in Africa, Asia and Latin America". *World Development*, Volume 31 (12): 1959–1975.
- [58] Todaro, M. and Smith, S. (2012), "Economic Development 11th Edition".
- [59] Toma, S.G., Grigore, A. and Marinescu, P. (2014), "Economic Development and Entrepreneurship". *Procedia Economics & Finance*, Volume 8: 436–443.
- [60] Velasco, A., Conchada, M.I., Gozon, B., Largoza, G., Perez, J. and Sarreal, E. (2013), Entrepreneurship in the Philippines: 2013 report.
- [61] Wahiba, N.F. and Weriemmi, M.E. (2014), "The Relationship between Economic Growth and Income Inequality". *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, Vol. 4 No. 1: 135-143.
- [62] Wennekers, S. and Thurik, R. (1999), Linking Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13: 27–55.
- [63] Wong, P.K. (2014), "An Exploratory Cross-Country Analysis of the Relationship between Entrepreneurial Propensity and Income Inequality".
- [64] Yanya, M., Abdul-Hakim, R. and Abdul-Razak, N. (2013), Does Entrepreneurship Bring An Equal Society and Alleviate Poverty? Evidence from Thailand. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 91: 331–340.
- [65] Zaman, R., Rashid, K., Khan, M.M. and Ahmad, M. (2011), "Panel Data Analysis of Growth, Inequality and Poverty: Evidence from Saarc Countries". *Journal of Yasar University*, 21(6): 3523-3537.