

Determinants of Financial Deepening in Mexico: A Dynamic Panel Data Approach

TÉLLEZ-LEÓN, ISELA ELIZABETH Escuela Superior de Economía Instituto Politécnico Nacional (México) Correo electrónico: tellezelizabeth_2015@yahoo.com

VENEGAS-MARTÍNEZ, FRANCISCO Escuela Superior de Economía Instituto Politécnico Nacional (México) Correo electrónico: fvenegas1111@yahoo.com.mx

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to study the determinants of financial deepening (FD) in Mexico. FD is measured as the fraction of total credit assigned to private sector as a proportion of GDP. The explanatory variables include: enforcing contracts (rule of law) and institutions; bank regulation; bank competition; formal labor; and financial literacy, among others. The data contains information of each State of the Mexican Republic. The model estimation is performed by using ordinary least squares (OLS), robust least square (RLS) with several weights functions (to deal with outliers), and a dynamic panel model (DPM) estimated with the generalized method of moments (GMM). The main findings are that: 1) the rule of law, 2) financial savings, and 3) financial education are the main determinants of financial deepening in Mexico.

Keywords: Financial deepening; factors affecting financial deepening; econometric modeling; Mexico. JEL classification: G00; C5; G38.

Artículo recibido el 5 de agosto de 2017 y aceptado el 22 de julio de 2018.

Determinantes de la Profundad Financiera en México: Un Enfoque de Datos De Panel Dinámico

RESUMEN

Este trabajo tiene como objetivo estudiar los determinantes de la profundad financiera (PF) en México. La PF se mide como el crédito total asignado al sector privado como proporción del PIB. Las variables explicativas incluyen: cumplimiento de contratos (estado de derecho) e instituciones; regulación bancaria; competencia bancaria; trabajo formal; y educación financiera, entre otros. Los datos contienen información de cada Estado de la República Mexicana. La estimación del modelo se realiza mediante el uso de mínimos cuadrados (MCO), mínimos cuadrados robustos (MCO) con varias funciones de ponderación (para tratar con valores atípicos) y un modelo de panel dinámico (MDP) estimado con el método generalizado de momentos (MGM). Los principales hallazgos son que: 1) el estado de derecho, 2) el ahorro financiero, y 3) la educación financiera en México.

Palabras claves: profundad financiera; factores que afecta la profundización financiera; modelación econométrica; México. **Clasificación JEL:** G00; C5; G38.



1. Introduction

Mexico represents one of the strongest emerging economies in Latin America and it expects to enhance its economic growth and welfare levels in the next decades. In Mexico banking competition shows a very high level of concentration. This concentration is stronger in the credit card and loans. However, in distant places of the countryside, credit alternatives are nonexistent, excluding more than 30 million people. One of the most important actions in order to reach this goal is to make accessible for most of the population the different services offer from the financial sector, including more credit for the private agents, with the purpose of creating an inclusive and liquid financial atmosphere, which is known as financial deepening. Financial deepening in Mexico is still lower compared with other similar economies; being very far from the industrialized ones. These facts encourages carrying out a study to find out why this is happening. Thus, the first step is to determine what factors could lead to boost and/or enhance financial deepening in Mexico. The second step is to attain a suitable regulation that encourages transparency, efficiency, and legal security (rule of law and institutions) for all the parties.

Financial deepening has to do with increasing the accessibility to financial services for all agents, foreign and domestic (individuals, households, investors, micro-entrepreneurs, small and medium firms, etc.). The specialized literature in this subject provides empirical evidence through a great number of investigations of many countries that financial deepening has a significant impact in: sustaining economic growth, mitigating systemic risk, lowering poverty, and reducing inequality levels. In the Mexican case is expected, in the short term, that improving financial deepening will lead to: financing the Small and Medium Enterprises (SME); boosting GDP, reducing vulnerability, enhancing stability, strengthening the banking sector, diversifying the financial sector, improving risk management, reinforcing regulation, and alleviating poverty in some extent.

As previously mentioned, financial deepening in Mexico is lower compared with other similar economies, which encourage carrying out a whole analysis that helps explaining why this is happening. In this regard, this paper inquires about the determinants of financial deepening in Mexico if any. As a proxy of financial deepening, as customary, it will be taken the total credit assigned to private sector as a proportion of GDP, which, in turn, may impact GDP growth (Levine, 1997, and Patrick, 1966). Other objective of this research is to provide policy recommendations that enable policy designers to shape a virtuous circle between financial deepening and GDP growth. In this regard, there is an extensive empirical literature about a positive association between financial deepening and economic growth, see for instance: King and Levine (1993); Levine and Zervos (1998); Levine et al. (2000); Loayza and Rancière (2006); and Venegas-Martínez et al. (2009). In addition, the relationship between the deepening of the financial system and the accumulation of physical capital has been analyzed by King and Levine (1993) and Levine and Zervos (1998). Also, Patrick (1966), and Greenwood and Jovanovic (1990) find empirical evidence of a positive relationship between real income growth and demand for financial services. It seems to be that in the specialized literature there is a general consensus that a deeper financial system contributes to a higher rate of long-term economic growth. In this research, we examine the determinants of financial deepening for the Mexican case. To do this, we analyze explanatory variables such as: enforcing contracts (rule of law); bank regulation; competition of commercial banks; informality in the labor market; financial savings, and financial literacy, among many others (La Porta et al. 1997, 1998; and Rajan and Zingales, 2003).

Regarding the literature about the determinants of financial deepening, we start out by mentioning the rule of law or the institutions. Institutions are defined by a comprehensive set of laws and practices. These are the product of historical, political, economic and social interactions. Mexico is considered a country with an institutional quality that has to be improved when comparing it with other countries. This issue has been studied by Caballero (2006) and Hernandez (2010). These authors examine the execution of contracts in México in order to propose a set of recommendations to improve the business and financial environment. Another factor of financial deepening is the regulation (set of rules that seek the healthy functioning of markets). For instance, international evidence shows that countries with higher capital requirements have less financial development; there is a negative correlation between these two variables. In this context, in order to amend this situation in Mexico some measures have been implemented, such as: limits on deposit insurance, stricter capital requirements regulation, disclosure and improvement of accounting standards, credit bureaus, and the improvement of risk management systems.

Regarding bank concentration, the empirical literature suggests that this is higher in countries with low economic and financial level (Tinoco-Zermeño *et al.*, 2014, and Beck *et al.*, 2004 and 2008). Beck and Demirgüç-Kunt (2009) analyze banking competition in several countries finding concentration. In Mexico, the banking system is relatively concentrated. Currently, around 68% of total banking assets are concentrated in the five large banks. In particular, the concentration appears to be higher in markets where the participation of non-bank intermediaries is low and demand is relatively inelastic. The concentration is stronger in the credit card market and in loans for housing and automobiles. In this case, in Mexico, "Sofoles" (limited-object financial institutions) represent an alternative to banks, mainly, for people that do not have access to banking services.

Also, the degree of informality in the labor market is an important factor that may affect financial deepening. The informal economy includes illegal production that is hidden from public authorities to avoid paying taxes an contributions to social security; see in this regard, Schneider *et al.* (2010). Finally, it is important to point out that Mexico is among the countries with a high proportion of semi-formal firms and informal employees.

Regarding the level of income, when this is low it leads to a lesser propensity to save, resulting in lower financial penetration because the resources available for lending are scarce. Financial penetration is related to savings and credit decisions that require knowledge about the characteristics of the available financial products. An important number of studies have found empirical evidence for a strong correlation between education and participation of the population in the financial system; see, for example: Grinblatt *et al.* (2011), Christelis *et al.* (2006), and Cole *et al.* (2011).

According to the above literature, the potential determinants of financial deepening may be: institutional environment, banking regulation, banking concentration, labor informality, propensity to save, and financial education. Other independent variables that have been used in applications and theoretical frameworks related to financial deepening in developing countries are listed in Table 1. This investigation is aimed at assessing the impact of these factors on financial deepening for the Mexican case through several econometric models including a panel data approach.

This paper is organized in the following sections. In the next section, we present the econometric models to be estimated, data contains information for each State of the Mexican Republic. In the third section, we analyze the obtained empirical results. Finally, the fourth section provides conclusions, acknowledges limitations, and states some simple recommendations to expand financial deepening in Mexico.

2. Empirical Analysis

As customary, the financial deepening will be measured as the private sector credit as a proportion of GDP. This measure is adequate for the Mexican case since its banking sector has some important presence in the credit market. The used data contains information for each State of the Mexican Republic. The literature to measure financial deepening points to different indicators that will be considered in this research: the size of the credit market (King and Levine 1993; Beck *et al.* 2000); the development of the securities market (Levine and Zervos 1998; Beck and Levine 2004); the size of the assets or financial liabilities in the economy (King and Levine 1993, and Rousseau and Wachtel 2001); and the number of bank branches (Dehejia and Lleras-Muney 2007).

2.1. Econometric analysis by States of the Mexican Republic

This section presents, first, the econometric model that will be used to inquire about the determinants of financial deepening for Mexico. Specifically, it will be applied ordinary least squares (OLS) and robust least squares (RLS). Notice that the traditional OLS estimator is given by:

$$\hat{\beta}_{OLS} = \left(\sum_{i} X_{i}^{'} X_{i}\right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i} X_{i}^{'} Y_{i}\right).$$
(1)

While un the RLS regression the residuals squared are replaced by a function that gives weights to outliers. In this case, the M-estimation method (the maximum likelihood estimation) determines the coefficients that maximize the sum of values of a function of the residuals:

$$\hat{\beta}_{M} = \arg\min_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f\left(\frac{e_{i}(\beta)}{\sigma w_{i}}\right)$$
(2)

where *S* is a measure of the level of residuals and *c* is a positive constant associated with function *f*. The individual weights are given by $w_i = \sqrt{1 - X_i (X'X)^{-1} X'_i}$. The choices on the function *f* may be of any the following form: Andrews, bi-square, Welsch and Fair. This research applies Akaike's information criterion and tests of goodness of fit to choose the best function *f*, which is given by Welsch functional form:

$$f(x) \equiv \frac{c^2}{2} \left(1 - \exp\left(-\left(\frac{X}{c}\right)^2 \right) \right)$$

$$c = 2.985$$
(3)

2.2 Description of data

As we state before, most of the literature uses as a *proxy* of financial deepening total credit that is directed towards to the private sector as a proportion of GDP. The period of study is 2010-2014, and the frequency of the data is annual. The observations belong to 32 Federal Entities with information of five years in each. Thus, the total number of observations is 160. Most of the incorporated variables come from specialized literature as exposed in Table 1. The database is public information from: INEGI, BANXICO, "*Doing Business*", SHCP, CNBV,

CONACYT, CONAPO, SEP, ANUIES, SEGOB, SNIEG y SIICYT. Since most of the literature uses as a *proxy* of financial deepening total credit that is directed towards to the private sector as a proportion of GDP, then the independent variables are constructed as the ratio between total credit to the private sector per State and its corresponding State GDP. Table 2 depicts the descriptive statistics of all the independent variables used in this research, and provides the mean, median, maximum, minimum, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. Half of them have a large kurtosis, that is, the empirical distributions have high peaks, and most of them show some degree of skewness. In order to deal with these characteristics, we will apply robust least square (RLS) in difference of logarithms with a weight function, specifically the Welsch function.

Independent variables (in Dlog)	Papers that use these variables in applications and theoretical frameworks related to financial depending
	deepening
Competition in notarial services (Institutional environment)	Ncube (2007)
Perception of corruption in government acts (Institutional	
environment)	Ncube (2007)
Illiteracy	Kurihara (2013)
New students at the undergraduate level (Human capital)	Baharumshah and Almasaied (2009); Adan (2017).
Coefficient of income inequality	Goodness C. A. (2013); Muritala and Fasanya (2013); Abosedra <i>et al</i> . (2016).
Starting a Business (New entrepreneurs)	King and Levine (1993b).
Registering a property (Institutional environment)	Ncube (2007)
Taxes, obligations, products, developments and improvements	Tatom and Ott (2006)
Employed in the informal sector (Underground economy)	Cobbi and Zizza (2012)
Linployed in the informal sector (Ondergroduate education (Human	
capital)	Baharumshah and Almasaied (2009): Adan (2017)
Absorption in higher education (Human capital)	Baharumshah and Almasaied (2009); Adan (2017).
Economic diversification	
(At industrial level)	Rajan and Zingales (1998).
Public debt	Altaylıgil and Akkay (2013).
Labor income	Donatella and Moranaxo (2016).
Savings	Gelbard and Leite (1999); Reinhart and Tokatlidis (2003).
Air freight	World Bank (1997).
	Gelbard and Leite (1999); Reinhart and Tokatlidis
Foreign direct investment	(2003); Baharumshah and Almasaied (2009).
Exports	Gries et al. (2008); Huang and Temple (2005).
Tourism Revenues_Source	Kumar (2013).
Researchers (Human capital)	Baharumshah and Almasaied (2009).
Scientific and technological Companies (Human capital)	Baharumshah and Almasaied (2009).
Population	Ng'ang'a (2016).

Table 1: Investigations related to the independent variables under study

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

Total Credit to Private / GDP State Enforcing Enforcing Competition notary services Perception of corruption in government New students at the undergradua te level Schooling Mean 6.82 0.40 4.00 85.25 6.78 23247.06 8.81 Median 5.89 0.39 3.97 85.19 5.45 16456.00 9.01 Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income Starting a inequality* Registering a property Own income of States efficiency terminal higher education diversificatio Meain 0.88
Total Credit to Private / GDP State Enforcing Enforcing Perception of corruption in notary Students at corruption in government students at the undergradua Mean 6.82 0.40 4.00 85.25 6.78 23247.06 8.81 Median 5.89 0.39 3.97 85.19 5.45 16456.00 9.01 Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34
to Private / GDP State Enforcing Enforcing Competition notary services corruption in government the undergradua Mean 6.82 0.40 4.00 85.25 6.78 23247.06 8.81 Median 5.89 0.39 3.97 85.19 5.45 16456.00 9.01 Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50
GDP State Enforcing Contracts notary services government acts undergradua Illiteracy undergradua te level Schooling Mean 6.82 0.40 4.00 85.25 6.78 23247.06 8.81 Median 5.89 0.39 3.97 85.19 5.45 16456.00 9.01 Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34
Sector Contracts services acts Illiteracy te level Schooling Mean 6.82 0.40 4.00 85.25 6.78 23247.06 8.81 Median 5.89 0.39 3.97 85.19 5.45 16456.00 9.01 Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income inequality* Registering a Business Own income of 5 states terminal education n Mean 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 <tr< td=""></tr<>
Mean 6.82 0.40 4.00 85.25 6.78 23247.06 8.81 Median 5.89 0.39 3.97 85.19 5.45 16456.00 9.01 Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income starting a Business Property of States High education higher diversificatio Median 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50
Median 5.89 0.39 3.97 85.19 5.45 16456.00 9.01 Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income inequality* Registering a Business Property of States terminal education n Median 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.
Maximum 31.27 0.74 11.15 95.28 19.00 95399.00 11.23 Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income inequality* Business Registering a property Own income of States High education Absorption in higher education diversificatio Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 4
Minimum 0.39 0.01 0.80 65.02 1.90 5284.00 6.21 Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income inequality* Starting a Business Registering a property Own income of States High terminal Absorption in higher education Economic diversificatio Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94<
Std. Dev. 5.44 0.17 2.30 6.34 4.23 20782.51 0.95 Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income inequality* Starting a Business Registering a property Own income of States High efficiency terminal Absorption in education Economic diversificatio Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3
Skewness 2.36 0.09 1.10 -0.99 1.24 2.14 -0.34 Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income Starting a inequality* Registering a Business Registering a property Own income of States High terminal Absorption in education Economic diversificatio Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39
Kurtosis 9.99 2.29 4.44 4.53 3.87 7.24 3.38 Coefficient of income inequality* Coefficient of Business Registering a property Own income of States High efficiency Absorption in higher Economic diversificatio Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61
Coefficient of income inequality*Starting a BusinessRegistering a propertyOwn income of StatesHigh efficiency terminalAbsorption in higher educationEconomic diversificatio diversificatioMean0.8831.7346.897.9161.8386.37706.72Median0.8330.2148.876.3262.1086.34701.50Maximum2.2564.4889.2041.1573.15130.35935.00Minimum0.334.834.272.6048.5438.15533.00Std. Dev.0.3913.1720.795.945.0818.57105.44Skewness1.110.150.053.720.04-0.300.54Kurtosis4.572.402.3918.982.522.672.61
income inequality* Starting a Business Registering a property Own income of States efficiency terminal higher education diversificatio n Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61
inequality* Business property of States terminal education n Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61
Mean 0.88 31.73 46.89 7.91 61.83 86.37 706.72 Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61
Median 0.83 30.21 48.87 6.32 62.10 86.34 701.50 Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61
Maximum 2.25 64.48 89.20 41.15 73.15 130.35 935.00 Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61
Minimum 0.33 4.83 4.27 2.60 48.54 38.15 533.00 Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61 Foreign direct
Std. Dev. 0.39 13.17 20.79 5.94 5.08 18.57 105.44 Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61 Foreign direct direct 0 0 0 0 0
Skewness 1.11 0.15 0.05 3.72 0.04 -0.30 0.54 Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61 Foreign direct
Kurtosis 4.57 2.40 2.39 18.98 2.52 2.67 2.61 Foreign direct
Foreign direct
direct
Public debt Average Attracting investment
per capita labor income savings Air traffic Air cargo (net) Exports
Mean 2532.20 5356.18 9.19 66.06 3183.67 1.05 27.41
Median 1910.96 5209.47 5.77 35.26 867.64 0.55 17.29
Maximum 12711.51 8537.06 37.27 306.19 14292.60 6.49 139.33
Minimum 0.00 3102.99 0.33 0.00 0.00 -0.42 0.20
Std. Dev. 2281.85 888.01 9.36 76.19 3880.46 1.32 30.39
Skewness 2.05 0.47 1.50 1.95 1.28 1.99 1.77
Kurtosis 8.03 4.08 4.65 6.25 3.73 7.18 6.07
Companies
and scientific
and Absorption_
Tourism technological Total_Conap Availability_o University_st Revenue_Me
Revenues Researchers institutions o population f_ATMs udies n
Mean 3.09 29.93 13.58 3567528.00 4.76 86.37 5669.24
Median 1.70 20.81 11.75 2753839.00 4.12 86.34 5540.04
Maximum 21.73 154.67 39.40 15963068.00 11.10 130.35 9072.18
Minimum 0.77 3.30 1.75 615963.00 1.64 38.15 3049.19
Std. Dev. 4.28 29.19 7.80 3005696.00 2.13 18.57 966.08
Skewness 3.15 2.78 0.83 2.19 0.75 -0.30 0.37

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of independent variables

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

Table 3 shows the results of the OLS estimates. For the sake of clarity, the source is put in front of the variable in the results of Table 3. The dynamics of the dependent variable for each State of Mexican Republic are shown in Appendix A.

According to Table 3, the OLS model provides a set of determinants of financial deepening that are statistically significant with the following results. If enforcing contracts increases by 1%, then total credit to the private sector improves 0.32%. If income inequality increases 1%, then the total credit to the private sector rises 0.65%, indicating concentration of income. If informal employees rise by 1%, the total credit to the private sector decreases 1.6%, which agrees with the specialized literature indicating that a large informal sector affects financial deepening since agents do not have collaterals to apply for credits.

Table 3: Factors of Financial Deepening (OLS)

Variables specified in <i>Dlog</i>	
Enforcing Contracts_Source: Doing Business 0.3 (0.0	316095*** .078146)
Competition in notarial services_Source: SEGOB, Bancos Jurídicos Intergubernamentales -0.0	.024901
Perception of corruption in government acts_Source: INEGI, ENCIG -0.4	.422956
Illiteracy_Source: SEP, Sistema Nacional de Información Educativa -0.0	.337525) .058543
(1.3 New students at the undergraduate level Source: ANUJES 0.0	.342101) 019114
(0.0	.059357)
(0.3 (0.3	.355155)
Starting a Business_Source: Doing Business -0.((0.0)	.050428 .076802)
Registering a property_Source: Doing Business -0	181611
Taxes, obligations, products, developments and improvements contributions as a percentage of total	.1999797
revenue Source: INEGL Statistics State and Municipal public finances	039511
(0)	085330)
Employed in the informal sector. Source: INEGLENOE -1	583246**
	773406)
High efficiency terminal Source: SED National Education Information System	251160
	50202)
Absorption in higher education_Source: SNIEG 0.0)7576
Economic diversification_Source: INEGI, DENUE -0.1	.363634) .1195
Public debt per capita_Source: SHCP -7.1	.276927) .73E-07
Average labor income_Source: INEGI, ENOE -0.7	.08E-05) .700798
(0.9	.924045)
Attracting savings_Source: CNBV -0.(0)	.002039 022402)
Air traffic_Source: SCT 0.0	000672
Air cargo_Source: SCT -0.0	.000802)
Foreign direct investment (net) _Source: Ministry of Economy -0.0	.08E-05) .008229
(0.1 Exports Source: INEGI 0.1	.020446) 106164
(0.)	.113176)
Tourism Revenues_Source: Banxico -0.0	.045818
(0.4 Researchers Source: CONACYT 0.2	.402634) 283746
(0.)	.509265)
Companies and scientific and technological institutions_Source: SIICYT 0.0	040213
Total Conapo population Source: CONAPO -1.	.5350047
(3.	.807512)
Constant 2.5 (1.	58705 .754320)

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Level of significance: (*) p < 0.1, (**) p < 0.05 and (***) p < 0.01. Source: Estimation with public data, the specific source is showed in front of each variable.

On the other hand, the estimation results from RLS are shown in Table 4. It is observed that the determinates of financial deepening that are statistically significant are: 1) rule of law (the enforcing contracts) and institutional environment; 2) propensity to save; 3) average labor

income; 4) income inequality; 5) total population_t-1; and 6) financial education; 7) researchers_t-1; 8) scientific and technological institutions_t-1; 9) banking regulation and banking concentration; 10) starting a business as a *proxy* of financial restrictions; 11) labor informality; 12) foreign direct investment_t-1; 13) exports_t-1; 14) income from tourism_t-1; and 14) air traffic_t-1. These variables are statistically significant and influence the dependent variable. In particular, the results support that formal markets upholds financial deepening. That is, formal labor has positive and significant impact on financial deepening.

Denendent veriekles Total Credit to Driveta / CDD State Contest	
Robust Least Squared Estimation	
log (Enforcing Contracts)	-0 110675***
	(0.029718)
log (Competition notary services) $t-1$	0.026483
	(0.024733)
log (Schooling)	0.390549
	(0.256243)
log (Coefficient of income inequality)	-0.140049*
	(0.080464)
Starting a Business	-0.004141***
	(0.001447)
log (Registering a property)	-0.008179
	(0.030950)
log (Own income of States)	0.080269*
	(0.044785)
log (Employees in the informal sector)	0.138612
	(0.191479)
Dlog (Terminal efficiency in school) _t-1	0.910932***
	(0.260811)
Public debt per capita_t-1	-0.0000181**
log (Average Jahor income)	(8.00E-00)
	-1.22174
$\log(\text{Attracting savings}) t - 1$	-0 0/2983***
	(0.016277)
Air traffic t–1	0.002263***
	(0.000473)
Load aérea t–1	-0.0000174**
-	(7.45E-06)
Foreign direct investment (net) <u>t</u> -1	0.028315**
	(0.012296)
Dlog (Exports) _t-1	0.222857***
	(0.076967)
Dlog (Income from tourism) _t-1	-0.727858***
	(0.172026)
Dl (Researchers)_t-1	-0.807555***
	(0.276170)
Dlog (Companies and scientific and technological institutions) _t-1	0.783196***
Los (Total Commo Demulation)	(14/350)
Log (Total_Conapo Population)	-0.049509**
Constant	(U.UZ57U4) 0 505021***
Constant	(1 919993)

Table 4: Determinants of Financial Deepening (RLS)

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses.

Level of significance: (*) p < 0.1, (**) p < 0.05 and (***) p < 0.01. Source: Estimation with public data.

In the sequel, this investigation will focus on Welsch function since Akaike's information criterion states that the best estimated model was such a function. Estimates from the fair or bi-square functions are less suitable due to a lower performance in their goodness

of fit. Notice now that although the goodness of fit of the estimates presented in Table 4 with RLS is better than that of Table 3 with OLS, some signs of statistically significant variables were contrary to what was expected. This was found in: enforcing contracts, starting a business, average labor income, attracting savings, and researchers. This is possibly because the indicators, at the time that the sample was taken, are inadequate and they need to be improved.

After applying the test of redundant fixed effects, we obtain that the null hypothesis is not rejected; see Table 5. Therefore, the panel model with fixed effects is not estimated.

Test	Statistics	d.f.	Prob.
Period F	0.882316	(1,42)	0.3529

Table 5: Test for fixed effects

Source: Estimation with public data.

It is important to point out that the individual effects are uncorrelated with the explanatory variables because the null hypothesis of the Hausman test is not rejected; see Table 6. Therefore, the panel cross-section with random effects model is more appropriate.

Table 6: Hausman test correlated random-effects

Source: Estimation with public data.

We will address the issue of endogenity of the variables through a dynamic panel model in the next section.

2.2 Dynamic Data Panel, System Generalized method of moments (GMM)

This section analyzes a dynamic data panel model. The following specification will be used to control for endogenity:

$$TCPS_GDP_{i,t} - TCPS_GDP_{i,t-1} = \delta + \gamma X_{i,t} + \beta' Z_{it} + u_{i,t}$$
(4)

where $TCPS_GDP_{i,t}$ is total credit to the private sector as a percentage of GDP by State of the Mexican Republic for the period 2010-2014, X stands for the vector of factors of financial deepening, and Z is the vector of control variables. The model follows the methodology GMM dynamic panel (Arellano and Bond, 1991). Table 7 shows the estimates by GMM system from the dynamic panel specification.

Instruments: LCREDBAN_GDPSTATE-3; TOTALPOBCONAPO-1;			
LOWINCOMESTATE-1; UNIDECON,-1			
Variable	Coefficient		
LBANCRED_GDPSTATE(-1)	0.60178		
	(0.73669)		
DL(Enforcing_Contracts)	2.37641**		
	(1.019668)		
DL(Property_registration)	0.739694		
	(1.397809)		
Availability_of_ATMs	0.028004		
	(0.032317)		
DL(Absorption_University_studies)	1.739272**		
	(0.739072)		
	-0.926712		
DL(Revenue_wen)	(1.103514)		
DL(Coefficient_income_inequality)	-1.045284**		
	(0.454715)		

Table 7. Estimates by GMM system from the dynamic panel

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses.

Dependent variable: DLCREDBAN_GDPSTATE

Level of significance: (*) p <0.1, (**) p <0.05 and (***) p <0.01.

Source: Estimation with public data.

From Table 7, it is observed that if the explanatory variable "enforcing contracts" increases by 1%, then the total credit to the private sector rises 2.4%, which is the *proxy* of financial deepening. This indicates that the rule of law and institutions are important for financial deepening in Mexico by States and for the whole country in the analyzed period. Also, financial education has a positive impact on financial deepening in Mexico. If financial education rises 1%, then the total credit to the private sector increases 1.7%. Finally, other important determinant of financial penetration is the savings level (taking as a *proxy* the coefficient of inequality income). This indicates that if the savings level rises 1%, then the financial deepening in Mexico are: 1) rule of law and institutions, 2) financial education, and 3) savings level.

3. Conclusions

We have estimated several econometric models, including a dynamic panel data approach. The data contains information for each State of the Mexican Republic. The explained variable was total credit assigned to the private sector as a proxy of financial deepening. The empirical evidence presented throughout this document shows that the main determinants of financial deepening are: rule of law or institutions; bank regulation; banking competition; formal labor; saving propensity, and financial education. It is worth mentioning that this research is innovative because we did not find another paper that addresses the issue with a panel data model by State. That is, the analysis incorporates all information available by the States of the Mexican Republic.

Although, there has been a noticeable improvement in financing conditions in Mexico in recent years, it is necessary that economic policy focuses on increasing financial deepening in all States of the Mexican Republic, mainly in the poorest. The recent financial reforms and financial inclusion programs may contribute to reach a greater financial deepening if a full strategy is designed considering all the obtained determinants in this research. This will improve economic growth rates in the States, and in general in Mexico. We insist that policy has to focus efforts on rule of law and institutions, increase financial education, and augment savings levels, possible by adjusting interest taxes without interfering with the objectives of monetary policy.

Bibliography

- Abosedra, A., M. Shahbaz, and K. Nawaz (2016). Modeling Causality between Financial Deepening and Poverty Reduction in Egypt. *Social Indicators Research*, 126(3): 955-969.
- Adan, I. R. (2017). The Relationship between Financial Deepening and Growth in Kenya. A Research Project Presented to the School of Business in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of Degree of Masters of Business Administration. University of Nairobi. Retrieved from: http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/102987/IBRAHIM%20RASHID %20ADAN.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Altaylıgil Y. B., and R. C. Akkay (2013). The Effect of the Domestic Debt on the Financial Development: A Case Study for Turkey, *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 5(5): 64-74.
- Arellano, M., and S. Bond (1991). "Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations". *Review of Economic Studies*, 58(2): 277-297.
- Baharumshah, A. Z., and S. W. Almasaied (2009). Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth in Malaysia: Interactions with Human Capital and Financial Deepening Emerging Markets. *Finance and Trade*, 45(1): 90-102.
- Beck, T., A. Demirgüc-Kunt, and R. Levine (2000). "A New Database on Financial Development and Structure". *World Bank Economic Review*, 14(3): 597-605.
- Beck, T., and A. Demirgüç-Kunt (2009). Financial Institutions and Markets across Countries and over Time: Data and Analysis. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4943.
- Beck, T., Demirguc-Kunt, A. and V. Maksimovic (2004). "Bank Competition and Access to Finance: International Evidence". *Journal of Money Credit and Banking*, 36 (3): 627-648.
- Beck, T., and R. Levine (2004). "Stock Markets, Banks and Growth: Panel evidence". Journal of Banking and Finance, 28(3): 423-442.
- Beck, T. and R. Levine (2000). New Firm Formation and Industry Growth Does Having a Market or Bank-Based System Matter? Policy Research Working Paper Series 2383, The World Bank.
- Beck, T., and M. S. Martinez (2008). Foreign Bank Acquisitions and Outreach: Evidence from Mexico. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series No. 4467.
- Beck, T., R. Levine, and N. Loayza, (2000). "Finance and the Sources of Growth". Journal of *Financial Economics*, 58(1-2): 261-300.
- Caballero, J. A. (2006). "Aumentando la competitividad del DF: Mejora del ambiente de negocios: ejecución de contratos". Banco Mundial, Mimeo.
- Christelis, D., J. Tullio, and M. Padula (2006). Cognitive Abilities and Portfolio Choice. Manuscrito, University of Salerno.
- Cole, S. A., A. L. Paulson, and S. G. Kartini (2011). Smart Money: The Effect of Education on Financial Behavior. Harvard Business School Finance Working Paper No. 09-071.
- Dehejia, R., and A. Lleras-Muney (2007). "Financial Development and Pathways of Growth: State Branching and Deposit Insurance Laws in the United States, 1900- 1940". *Journal* of Law and Economics, 50(2): 239-272.
- Donatella Baiardi, B. and C. Moranaxo (2016). Financial Deepening and Income Distribution Inequality in the Euro Area. Working Paper. Università di Milano. Retrieved from: http://www.ecineq.org/ecineq_nyc17/FILESx2017/CR2/p12.pdf

- Gelbard, E. A., and S. P. Leite (1999). Measuring Financial Development in Sub-Saharan Africa. Working Paper 99/105, 1999, International Monetary Fund. Retrieved from: http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/1999/wp99105.pdf
- Gobbi, G., and R. Zizza (2012). Does the Underground Economy Hold Back Financial Deepening? Evidence from the Italian Credit Market. *Economia Marche Journal of Applied Economics*. 31(1): 1-29.
- Goodness C. A. (2013). Causality between Financial Deepening, Economic Growth and Poverty in Nigeria. *Business and Management Review*, 3(3): 1-11.
- Greenwood, J., and B. Jovanovic (1990). "Financial Development, Growth, and the Distribution of Income". *The Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 1076-1107.
- Gries, T., M. Kraft and D. Meierrieks (2008). Linkages between Financial Deepening, Trade Openness and Economic Development: Causality Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa April 2008 Center for International Economics. Working Paper Series. Retrieved from: http://groups.uni-paderborn.de/wp-wiwi/RePEc/pdf/ciepap/WP15.pdf
- Grinblatt, M., Matti, K., and J. Linnainmaa (2011). "IQ and Stock Market Participation". Journal of Finance, 66(6): 2119-2164.
- Huang, Y. and J. R. W. Temple, (2005). Does external finance promote financial development? Discussion Paper 5150, 2005, CEPR at the University of Bristol. Retrieved from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=785244
- King, R. G., and R. Levine, (1993). Finance, Entrepreneurship and Growth. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32(3): 513-542.
- Kotarski, K. (2015). Financial deepening and income inequality: Is There any Financial Kuznets Curve in China? The Political Economy Analysis. *China Economic Journal*, 8(1): 18-39.
- Kumar, R. R. (2013). Exploring the role of technology, tourism and financial development: An empirical study of Vietnam. *Quality and Quantity*, 48(5): 2881-2898.
- Kurihara, Y. (2013), Does Financial Skill Promote Economic Growth? International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3(92): 92-97.
- La Porta, R., y F. López-de-Silanes (1998). Capital Markets and Legal Institutions. Harvard University.
- La Porta, R., F. Lopez-De-Silanes, A. Shleifer, and R. W. Vishny (1997). Legal Determinants of External Finance. *The Journal of Finance*, 52(3): 1131-1150.
- Levine, R. (1997). Financial Development and Economic Growth: Views and Agenda. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(2), 688-726.
- Levine, R., N. Loayza, N., and T. Beck (2000). "Financial Intermediation and Growth: Causality and Causes". *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 46(1): 31-77.
- Muritala, T. A., and I. O. Fasanya (2013). Relationship Between Sustainable Financial Services and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria. Evidence from Error Correction Model. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 2: 39-50.
- Ncube, M. (2007). Financial Services and Economic Development in Africa. *Journal of African Economies* 16, AERC Supplement 1, 13-57. Retrieved from: https://ideas.repec.org/a/oup/jafrec/v19y2010isuppl_1p114-164.html
- Ng'ang'a, L. (2016). Relationship between Financial Deepening and Economic Growth In Kenya. A Research Project Presented to the School of Business in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of Degree of Masters in Science of Commerce of Kenya College of Accountancy (KCA) University. Retrieved from: http://41.89.49.13:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/1150?show=full
- Patrick, H. (1966). "Financial Development and Economic Growth in Underdeveloped Countries". *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 14(2): 174-189.
- Rajan, R., and L. Zingales (1998). "Financial Dependence and Growth". *The American Economic Review*, 88(3): 559-586.
- Rajan, R. G., and Zingales, L. (2003). The Great Reversals: The Politics of Financial Development in the Twentieth Century. Journal of financial economics, 69(1), 5-50.

- Reinhart, C. M. and I. Tokatlidis (2003). Financial Liberalisation: The African Experience. *Journal* of African Economies 12, AERC Supplement 2: 53-88. Retrieved from: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/13423/1/MPRA_paper_13423.pdf
- Schneider, F., A. Buehn, and C. E. Montenegro (2010). "Shadow Economies All Over the World". *International Economic Journal*, 24(4): 443-461.
- Tatom, J. and M. Ott (2006). Money and Taxes: The Relationship between Financial Sector Development and Taxation. Working Paper, Munich Personal RePEc Archive. Retrieved from: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/4117/
- Tinoco-Zermeño, M. A, F. Venegas-Martínez y V. H. Torres-Preciado (2014). "Growth, Bank Credit, and Inflation in Mexico: Evidence from an ARDL-bounds Testing Approach". *Latin American Economic Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1, Article 1, pp. 1-22.
- Venegas-Martínez, F., M. A. Tinoco-Zermeño, V. H. Torres-Preciado, (2009). "Desregulación financiera, desarrollo del sistema financiero y crecimiento económico en México: efectos de largo plazo y causalidad". *Estudios Económicos*, 24(48): 249-283.
- World Bank (1997). China 2020: Development Challenges in the New Century. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. World Bank, Washington DC.

