FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA (1980-2015).

ADOFU ILEMONA AND GIMBA OBADIAH J.

DEAPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, FEDERAL UNIVERSITY LAFIA, NIGERIA
CORRESPONDING AUTHOR EMAIL: ilemonaadofu@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Economic growth and factors that determine it has been a conflicting debate mainly in developing countries. This paper strive to analyse the empirical and causal relationship between foreign direct investment, balance of payment, real exchange rate, investment rate, gross national savings and gross domestic product growth in Nigeria covering the period 1980 to 2015. It makes use of the Vector Error Correction Model approach and the Granger causality test. The results show that there is only one cointegrating equation. Taking into account a long term relationship, foreign direct investment, balance of payment and investment rate moves positively with GDP growth rate. Real exchange rate had a negative relationship with GDP growth rate. Furthermore, the Granger causality test revealed unidirectional influence from foreign direct investment and GDP growth, real exchange rate and GDP growth and investment rate to GDP growth. The study recommend a huge investment in public infrastructure such as rail, power, roads, education, health services, etc. because they are complementary to private investment which can increase the marginal product of private capital thereby enhancing growth.

Key words: Foreign direct investment, balance of payment, exchange rate, economic stability, economic growth.

INTRODUCTION

Foreign direct investment (FDI) is an investment made by a foreign person or organization in a particular country. It is investment that comes from abroad. Kumar (2007), described Direct Foreign Investment in several ways. First and most likely, it may involve parent enterprise injecting equity capital by purchasing shares in foreign affiliates. Second, it may take the form of reinvesting the affiliate's earning.

Oyatoye, Arogundade K.K., Adebisi, S.O., and Oluwakayode E.F., (2011), discussed that GDP as a measure of economic output, has its own defects especially in measuring final output.

These defects include difficulties of distinguishing between final and intermediate products which may results in double counting. For this study GDP is adopted because it is the most reliable indicator of measuring economic growth in developing countries. A higher GDP implies a brighter prospect for FDI in Nigeria. Since FDI comes into a country to enable it have a better economy, it would boost the GDP.

Foreign Direct Investment augments domestic investment, which is crucial to the attainment of sustained growth and development. Consequently, many developing countries, Nigeria included, have offered generous incentives to attract FDI inflows and, in addition, undertaken macroeconomic reforms, often under pressure from Bretton Woods Institutions, also geared towards the same end creating an investor-friendly environment. Some foreign firms have taken advantage of the incentives to satisfy their various motives of ensuring stable monopolistic control over sources of raw materials for their parent companies, access to control of local markets, utilizing low cost labour and realizing the possibility of higher returns and until the last five years, Nigeria also received very low proportions of global FDI inflows, in spite of its being blessed with enormous human and natural resources. This is perhaps because the economy was perceived by investors as a high-risk market for investment.

The foreign direct investor may acquire 10 percent or more of the voting power of an enterprise in an economy through; incorporating a wholly owned subsidiary or company, acquiring shares in an associated enterprise, through merger or an unrelated enterprise and, participating in an equity joint venture with another investor. Foreign direct investment incentives may be in form of low corporate and income tax rates, tax holidays, other types of tax concessions, preferential tariffs, special economic zones, investment financial subsidies, soft loan or loan guarantees, free land or land subsidies, relocation and expatriation subsidies, job training

and employment subsidies, infrastructure subsidies, research and development support and derogation from regulations, usually for very large projects (Obadan, 2004).

According to Olokoyo (2012), attempts at attracting FDI into Nigerian economy have been based on the need to maximize the potential benefits derived from them; and to minimize the negative effects their operations could impose on the country. As a result of the persistent global panic, unemployment has been on the rise, jobs are being lost, there is shortage of liquidity and acute scarcity of credit has remained visible in the financial institutions. For Nigeria to generate more foreign direct investment, efforts should be made at solving problems of government involvement in business; relative closed economy; corruption; weak public institutions; and poor external image. Nigeria is one of the economies with great demand for goods and services and has attracted some FDI over the years. According to CBN (2006), the amount of FDI inflow into Nigeria reached US$2.3 billion in 2003 and it rose to US$5.31 billion in 2004 (138% increase). Published UNCTAD report(2013) has it that Foreign Direct Investment in Nigeria stood at US$6.10 billion in 2010 and rose toUS$8.92 billion in 2011; however, it dropped to US$7 billion in 2012 representing 21.34% decrease. The report further disclosed that despite the drop, Nigeria still accounted for 41% of FDI flow to West Africa and 14% of the total flow to Africa. The decline was alluded to political insecurity and weak global economy occasioned by the popular Global Financial Crises.

In Nigeria, FDI is defined as an investment undertaken by an enterprise that is either wholly or partly foreign-owned. The Investment Code that created the Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC) (Decree No. 16 of 1995) and the Foreign Exchange (Monitoring and Miscellaneous Provision) Decree, also enacted in 1995, gives full backing for FDI in Nigeria. Nigeria has a high potential to attract significant foreign private investment inflow. Most

countries strive to attract FDI because of its acknowledged advantages as a tool of economic development. Africa and Nigeria in particular, joined the rest of the world in seeking FDI as evidenced by the formation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), which has the attraction of foreign investment to Africa as a major component. Openness to trade and available human capital, however, are not FDI inducing. FDI in Nigeria contributes positively to economic growth. Although the overall effect of FDI on economic growth may not be significant, the components of FDI do have a positive impact. The FDI in the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) sector has the highest potential to grow the economy and is in multiples of that of the oil sector.

Various classifications have been made of foreign direct investment (FDI). Policymakers believe that FDI produces positive effects on host economies. Some of these benefits are in the form of externalities and the adoption of foreign technology. Externalities here can be in the form of licensing agreements, imitation, employee training and the introduction of new processes by the foreign firms (Alfaro, 2006). When FDI is undertaken in high risk areas or new industries, economic rents are created accruing to old technologies and traditional management styles. These are highly beneficial to the recipient economy. In addition, FDI helps in bridging the capital shortage gap and complement domestic investment especially when it flows to a high risk areas of new firms where domestic resource is limited. Foreign direct investment is starting to shift more and more towards services; these services are also becoming more traditional. Foreign investment has provided a lot of opportunities such as employment opportunities, infrastructure and technology transfer, increased productive efficiency, etc. In conclusion, considering the wide range of critical empirical studies on how foreign direct investment in Nigeria affects its economic growth and development, one cannot draw conclusions from it with minimal

acceptable level of confidence. Therefore, in the context of the above, there is need for further studies to be carried out on how FDI affects the growth of the Nigerian economy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Abundant literature exists on FDI in Nigeria written by various authors and for various purposes. This fact underscores the essence, importance and relevance of this sector in the growth of any given economy.

Foreign direct investment (FDI) is a major component of foreign investment. FDI is generally investment made to acquire lasting interest in an enterprise operating in an economy other than that of the investor, the investor's purpose being an effective voice in the management or control of an enterprise (IMF, 1977).

Carkovic and Levin (2002) highlighted that the economic rationale for offering special incentives to attract DFI frequently derives from the belief that foreign investment produces externalities in the form of technology transfers and spillovers. Curiously, the empirical evidence of these benefits both at the firm level and at the national level remains ambiguous. DeGregorio (2003) while contributing to the debate on the importance of FDI, note that FDI may allow a country to bring in technologies and knowledge that are not readily available to domestic investors, and in this way increases productivity growth throughout the economy, DFI may also bring in expertise that country does not possess, and foreign investors may have access to global markets. He also found that increasing aggregate investment percentage point of GDP and increased economic FDI is associated with higher economic growth in some country, while this situation had also been seen as having higher incidence of economic crisis in some other countries.FDI has also been argued to act as a catalyst for inward investment by complementing

local resources and providing a signal of confidence in investment opportunities (Agosin and Mayer, 2000). New projects may invite complementary local private investments that provide inputs to, or use outputs of the foreign firms. It is also likely that private investment increases by more than the FDI flows because foreign equity capital finances only part of the total investment project. A substantial part of foreign investment projects is usually financed from local financial markets as well. It should be noted that the foreign capital inflows, by themselves, can lead to increase in domestic credit supply (Jansen, 1995).

FDI is an effective strategy that is used by developing countries of the world to achieve economic growth and development. Nigeria with its large reserves of human and natural resources presents foreign investors with a unique market in which to invest their money. However, as can be seen by the large multinationals in the oil sector, such investments though having great economic benefits to various groups who are equally stakeholders in the industry, it might not in the long run guarantee sustainable development in its entire ramifications. For FDI to impact on sustainable growth and development, both the public and private sector must pursue corporate social responsibility as an end in itself. From the public sector, the creation of a competitive economy through economic policies such as deregulation and privatization should be pursued. The private sector, companies, especially multinational corporations should voluntarily comply with various international, national and industrial regulations and code of conduct.

FDI is a form of lending or finance in the area of equity participation. It generally involves the transfer of resources, including capital, technology, and management and marketing expertise. Such resources usually extend the production capabilities of the recipient country (Odozi 1995). According to Ekpo (1997), the factors influencing foreign direct investment

include; inflation, exchange rate, uncertainty, credibility, government expenditure as well as institutional and political factors. Other factors include; domestic interest rates, debt service, credit rating and political stability. For years, it has been unclear whether developing countries benefit from devoting substantial resources to attracting FDI.

In order to bring Nigeria into more competitive position for FDI, the government has legislated two major laws to guarantee investments against nationalization by any tier of government, and to ensure the free transfer and repatriation of funds from Nigeria. The two laws in question are the Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC) Act 16 and Foreign Exchange (Monitoring and Miscellaneous Provision) Act 17, both of which were enacted in 1995. The commission is located in Nigeria's capital, Abuja. The NIPC was established to address the problems of multiplicity of government agencies which investors confront when they come to Nigeria. Thus, the commission assists investors in going through the formerly cumbersome process of pre-investment registrations within two weeks. The commission guarantees the protection of foreign interests in Nigeria against expropriation, administers appropriate incentive packages available to investors, guarantees transferability of profits and other funds by investors, and identify difficulties and problems encountered by investors, proffer solutions and render assistance to them. The Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission (NIPC) provides up-to-date information on investment opportunities available in the country, links foreign investors with local partner, provides information on available incentives for investment, issues business permits to foreign investors, coordinates the issuance of expatriate quota, negotiates in consultation with appropriate government agencies, specific incentive packages for investors, enters directly into bilateral agreement with investors for purposes of

investment promotion, and identifies specific project and invites interested investors to partake in them.

Empirical literature

Considerable amount of empirical studies exist that examine the determinants of ForeignDirect investment and its impact on both the host and home country. Many research works have shown that the contribution of FDI to growth is positive. Using different data and methodologies, many researchers have concluded that FDI has positive impact on growth.

Bevan and Estrin (2000) examined the determinants of ForeignDirect Investment (FDI) in transitional economies of Central and Eastern Europe. They found that DFIs are determined by host country risk rating, unit labour cost in host economy, host market size and gravity factors. They also found the credit rating of the host country to be significantly influenced by private sector development, industrial development, government balance and the level of corruption.

Loungari and Razin (2001), reported that of the three sources of capital flow to the developing countries (FDI, Portfolio investment and primary bank loans), FDI was discovered to be the most resilient during the global financial crises from 1997 – 1998 and also during the Latin American financial crises in the 1980s. Moses, Ramachandran and Shah (2005) had a similar conclusion in their study which focused on three countries in Africa, namely, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. It was discovered that the percentage of export that was from multinational enterprises (MNEs) was far more than the one from local investors. This shows that Direct Foreign Investment (FDI) contributed more to GDP than local investment in the three countries.

Nunnenkamp and Spatz (2003), contributed to the view that developing countries shoulddraw on Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) to create economic growth and development.

They concluded thatthe growth impacts of FDI are ambiguous because of highly aggregated FDI data. Bydisaggregating FDI on economic conditions prevailing in the host country, the positive growtheffects of FDI are doubtful. Host country and industry characteristics as well as the interplaybetween both sets of characteristics determine the growth impact of FDI in developing nations.

Otepola (2002) examines the importance of direct foreign investment in Nigeria. The study empirically examined the impact of FDI on growth. He concluded that FDI contributes significantly to growth especially through exports. This study recommends a mixture of practical government policies to attract ForeignDirect Investment (FDI) to the priority sectors of the economy.

Some research works agree that the FDI contribution to growth is positive but depend on some factors in the host country. Alfaro (2006) affirmed that the contribution of FDI to growth depends on the sector of the economy where the FDI operates. He claimed that FDI inflow to the primary sectors tends to have a negative effect on growth, however as for the service sector, the effect of FDI inflow is not so clear.

Lall (2002) opined that FDI inflow affects many factors in the economy and these factors in turn affect economic growth. This review shows that the debate on the impact of FDI on economic growth is far from being conclusive. The role of FDI seems to be country specific and can be positive, negative or insignificant, depending on the economic, institutional and technological conditions in the recipient countries.

Obwona (2001) notes in his study of the determinants of ForeignDirect Investment (FDI) and their impact on growth in Uganda that macroeconomic and political stability and policy

consistency are important parameters determining the inflow of FDI into Uganda and that FDI affects growth positively but insignificant.

Oyatoye, et al, (2011) highlighted as a result of their study on FDI and export on economic growth in Nigeria that FDI led to increase in export which in turn, showed a positive impact on gross domestic product growth.

METHODOLOGY

Model specification

The data used in this analysis are yearly data for the years 1980 to 2015. The data on gross domestic product growth rate (GDPG), balance of payment (BOP), real exchange rate (RER) and foreign direct investment (FDI) were taken from the World Bank (2015) data base. Data on investment rate (IR) and gross national savings (GNS) were taken from the Economy Watch.

In this study the method of Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) approach and the Granger causality test is adopted to determine the effect of foreign direct investment, balance of payment, real exchange rate, investment rate and gross national savings.

In order to test the causal relationship discussed above, we specify the following VECM model.

$$GDPG_t = f(FDI_t, BOP_t, RER_t, IR_t, GNS_t)$$

Where GDPG = GDP growth rate
FDI is the ration of foreign direct investment to GDP
BOP is the ratio of balance of payment to GDP
RER `is the real exchange rate

IR is the ratio of investment rate to GDP
GNS is the ratio of gross national savings to GDP
All the variables are expressed in their logarithm.

Stationarity Test

Like any time series, it is important to determine the time series properties of the data. In this case we used the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test. This is because if variables are non stationary, suitable properties of consistency, efficiency and unbiasedness will be lost which will lead to spurious regression. The problem of non stationary data can be tackled by differencing time series data. The null hypothesis of ADF is the presence of unit root and the alternative hypothesis is stationary. The decision rule is that when the absolute value of the test statistics is greater than the absolute critical value we reject the null hypothesis of unit root.

Lag selection

The selection of the appropriate lag order is the next step. VECM is a dynamic process and economic theory is handicap in determining the lag length. Therefore we will rely on the major lag selection test which are Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), the Schwarz Bayesian Criterion (SBC) and the Hanna and Quinn Criterion (HQC).

Vector Error Correction Model

The VECM is a special case of the vector autoregressive for variables that are stationary in their differences i.e I(1). The VECM takes into account any cointegrating relationships among variables. The theory behind the VECM is that there often exist a long run equilibrium relationship among economic variables, for example there may be disequilibrium in the short run however with the error correction mechanism, a fraction of the disequilibrium in the previous period is corrected in the next period. The error correction mechanism could be seen as an effective instrument to reconcile short run and long run relationship. A typical example of VECM with two variables Y and X is given below

$$\Delta Y_t = \alpha_1 + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_i \Delta Y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \phi_i \Delta X_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \gamma_i Z_{t-i} + e_t$$

$$\Delta X_t = \alpha_2 + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_i \Delta Y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \phi_i \Delta X_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{n} \gamma_i Z_{t-1} + e_t$$

Granger causality test

The VECM does not specify cointegration between two variables does not specify the direction of a causal relation between variables. Economic theory suggests there is granger causality in at least one direction. Assuming there is only one cointegrating equation, a general specification of the granger causality test in a two variable model of Y and X are expressed as:

$$Y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_{t-1} + \cdots + \alpha_i Y_{t-i} + \beta_1 X_{t-1} + \cdots + \beta_i X_{t-i} + \varepsilon(i)$$

$$X_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_{t-1} + \cdots + \alpha_i X_{t-i} + \beta_1 Y_{t-1} + \cdots + \beta_i Y_{t-i} + \varepsilon(ii)$$

Where ε is the white noise.

We can obtain two test from this analysis. Equation (i) explore a null hypothesis that X does not granger cause Y and (ii) examines the null hypothesis that Y does not granger cause X. if we reject the null of equation (i) and refuse to reject the null of equation (ii), it means Y changes are granger caused by X in equation (i) but X changes are not granger caused by Yin equation (ii). Unidirectional causality will take place between two variables if either the null hypothesis of equation (i) or (ii) is rejected. Bidirectional causality exist if both null hypotheses are rejected. No causality exists if neither the null hypothesis of the two equations is rejected.

Presentation of the results

Using the ADF test, we found that all the variables were not stationary at levels but became stationary at first difference as presented on the table below.

Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test

Variables	ADF test statistics	5% Critical value	Order of integration
GDPG	-5.050	-2.978	I(1)
FDI	-5.439	-2.978	I(1)
BOP	-4.707	-2.978	I(1)
RER	-4.244	-2.978	I(1)
IR	-5.386	-2.978	I(1)
GNS	-4.285	-2.978	I(1)

Source: author's computation

Since all the variables are stationary at first difference, they are suitable for VECM.
However the choice of the right lag order is the next crucial step. This is presented on the table below

Lag selection test

Lag	AIC	HQIC	SBIC
0	41.189	41.185	41.458
1	39.489	40.132	41.375
2	39.391*	40.585	42.892

*means a lag length of 2 using the AIC test is suitable.
Source: author's computation

We advance to run the cointegration test using the Johansen technique. The number of cointegrating vector is ascertain using the trace statistics and the eigenvalues as shown on the table below.

Max rank	Eigen values	Trace statistics	5% critical value
0		138.26	94.15
1	0.55	44.89*	47.21
2	0.45	24.71	29.68
3	0.25	14.73	15.41

*means the presence of one cointegrating vector
Source: author's computation
From the table above with a maximum rank of 1 at 5% level of significance we refuse to reject the null of no cointegrating rank. Given that the variables are cointegrated we then estimate the error correction model.

	Coefficient	Standard error	Z	$P>\|z\|$	95% confidence interval
Ce1	-1.39	0.394	-3.54	0.00	-2.165 -0.622

Variables	Coefficient	P-values
InGDP	1	0.01
Constant term	-2.84	0.00
InFDI	0.85	0.02
InBOP	0.18	0.00
InRER	-0.52	0.00
InIR	0.66	0.00
InGNS	0.35	0.08

The error correction term is -1.39. it is negative and significant which implies that there is a long run relationship between FDI, BOP, RER, IR and GNS with economic growth. The ECT is also the speed of adjustment. It is the speed at which the determining variables will adjust towards the long run equilibrium, in this case 139%.

The long run relationship between GDP growth rate, FDI, BOP, RER, IR and GNS is stated below.

$$¿GDPG_t = -2.836 + 0.85 \in FDI_t + 0.76 \in BOP_t + 0.66 \in IR_t + 0.35 \in GNS_t - 0.52\, InRER_t$$

All the coefficients are significant with probability values of less than 5% except for GNS which is not significant. When variables are in logarithms and one cointegrating vector is estimated, the coefficients can be interpreted as long run elasticities. The estimated model was able to produce a

consistent result. A 1% increase in FDI is likely to increase GDP growth by 0.85% . FDI inflows can affect capital formation because it is a source of financing which will eventually enhance productivity. An increase in the BOP by 1% will lead to a likely growth of 0.76%. This concurs with economic theory. A favourable balance of payment where exports exceeds imports will enhance economic growth. A depreciation of the domestic currency by 1% in relation to a basket of foreign currencies will possibly grow the economy by 0.52%. Again this agrees with apriori expectation. More of goods and services will be exported when domestic currency is devalued thereby enhancing growth. A 1% increase in investment rate will likely grow the GDP rate by 0.66%.

Granger causality test

Null hypotheses	χ^2	Probability	Decision
FDI does not Granger cause GDPG	3.49	0.017*	Reject the null
BOP does not Granger cause GDPG	2.43	0.296	Do not reject the null
RER does not Granger cause GDPG	12.89	0.002*	Reject the null
IR does not Granger cause GDPG	4.75	0.043*	Reject the null
GNS does not Granger cause GDPG	2.44	0.295	Do not reject the null

Note: *denotes 5% level of significance
Source: author's computation

There is a unidirectional causality running from FDI to GDPG, RER to GDPG and IR to GDPG. No causality exist between BOP to GDPG and GNS to GDPG.

Recommendation

Following the outcome of our analysis, this study wish to recommend thus;

There should be a huge investment in public infrastructure such as rail, power, roads, education, health services, etc. because they are complementary to private investment which can increase the marginal product of private capital thereby enhancing growth.

FDI in host countries influences macroeconomic variables such as employment, exports, consumption and savings. This in turn enhance growth, therefore government have a role of creating an enabling environment such as political and macroeconomic stability for FDI to thrive. A sound policy, broad based, non discriminatory and predictable regulatory framework with efficient supporting institutions to enforce the relevant laws and regulations will attract FDI to Nigeria. In addition, Nigeria's policies and practices should be aimed at reducing investors cost and the perceived risk associated with the investment as well as creating an investment climate conducive for the economy to benefit from such investment. There should be no barriers to business incorporation, company registration, visas, and work permit.

A poorly managed exchange rate can be disastrous for economic growth. Avoiding a significant overvaluation of the naira is imperative for growth. Overvaluation hinders growth while undervaluation enhances growth. Overvalued currencies are associated with foreign currency shortages, rent seeking and corruption, unsustainably large current account deficits all of which are detrimental to growth. Therefore government should provide a robust management of the foreign exchange to enhance growth.

Conclusion

In this paper an effort was made to examine the relationship among the factors that determine economic growth such as foreign direct investment, balance of payment, real exchange rate, investment rate, and gross national savings using the annual data over the period 1980 – 2015.

The empirical analysis suggests that the examined variables had a unit root at levels then became stationary at first difference. The methodology of the vector error correction was applied to

estimate the long-run relationship. There was one cointegrating equation and the error correction term was proved to be statistically significant at 5% level of significance. The Granger causality test infer there is a unidirectional causality relationship running from foreign direct investment to GDP growth, real exchange rate to GDP growth and investment rate to GDP growth rate.

REFERENCES

Agosin, M. & Mayer, R. (2000), "Foreign Investment in Developing Countries: Does it Crowd in Domestic Investment?" *UNCTAD Paper,* No.146.

Bevan, A.A and S. Estirin, (2000), The Determinant of Foreign Direct Investment in Transitional Economies. William Davidson Institute Working Paper 342

Alfaro, L. (2006), "How Does Foreign Direct Investment Promote Economic Growth? Exploring the Effects of Financial Markets on Linkages", *NBER working paper,* No 12522.

Carkovic, M. and R. Levine (2002): Does foreign direct investment accelerate economicgrowth? *University of Minnesota Working paper*, Minneapolis.

CBN (2006), *CBN Statistical Bulletin*, Abuja: Central Bank of Nigeria Press.

Central Bank of Nigeria (2013): Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin, Abuja, Nigeria.

United Nations Conference on Trade And Development (UNCTAD) 2013 report In Vanguard Newspaper of 27th June, 2013 (online).

De Gregorio, Jose (2003): The role of foreign direct investment and natural resources ineconomic development. *Working paper No 196 Central Bank of Chile*, Santiago.

Ekpo, A. H. (1997); "Foreign Direct Investment in Nigeria: Evidence from Time Series Data", *CBN Economic and Financial Review*, 35 (1), pp. 35 -42.

IMF, (1977); "World Economic Outlook", Washington: International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Jansen, K. (1995); "Foreign Direct Investment, Information Technology and Economic Growth in the MENA Region", *World Development*, 23(2), pp.193-210.

Kumar A. (2007): Foreign direct investment; *Insights from the Federal Reserve Bank ofDallas*; Vol. 2, No 1.

Lall (2002): Foreign investment transactional and development countries, *MacmillanPress Ltd*, London.

Loungan, P. and A. Razin, (2001), "How Beneficial is Foreign Direct Investment for Developing Countries" Finance and Development. 38(2)

Moses, T., Ramachandran, V., & Shah, M. (2005); "Is Africa's Skepticism of Foreign Capital Justified?-Evidence from East African Firm Survey Data", *Center for Global Development Working Paper,* No. 41.

Nunnenkamp, P.O. and J. Spatz. (2003): FDI and economic growth in developingcountries: how relevant are host country and industry characteristics; *Kiel Working PaperNo* 1176.

Obadan, M. I. (2004); "*Foreign Capital Flows and External Debt: Perspectives on Nigeria and the LDCs Group*". Lagos: Broadway Press Ltd.

Obwona M. B. (2001): Determinants of foreign direct investment and their impactson economics growth in Uganda". *African Development Review*, 13 (1) 46 – 80Blackwell Publishers, Oxford UK.

Odozi, V.A. (1995); "An Overview of Foreign Investment in Nigeria 1960-1995". *CBN Research Department Occasional Paper,* No.11, p. 41.

Olokoyo, Omowunmi F. (2012), Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth: A case of Nigeria. *BVIMSR's Journal of Management Research, Vol. 4, No. 1, April 2012.*

Otepola A. (2002): Foreign direct investment as a factor of economic growth in Nigeria;*Africa Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP)*, Dakar, Senegal.

Oyatoye, E.O., Arogundade, K.K., Adebisi, S.O. and Oluwakayode, E.F. (2011), Foreign Direct Investment, Export and Economic Growth in Nigeria. *European journal of Humanities and Social sciences Vol. 2, No.1.*

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Data showing various values on both the endogenous and exogenous variables from the year 1993 to 2013.

YEAR	GDP	FDI	BOP	EXR
1994	1399703.22	22229.2	42623.3	21.8861
1995	2907358.18	75940.6	195216.3	21.8861
1996	4032300.34	111290.9	53152.0	21.8861

1997	4189249.77	110542.7	1076.2	21.8861
1998	3989450.28	80749.0	220671.3	21.8861
1999	4679212.05	92792.5	326634.3	92.6934
2000	6713574.84	115952.2	314139.2	102.1052
2001	6895198.33	132433.7	24729.9	111.9433
2002	7795758.35	225224.8	563483.9	120.9702
2003	9913518.19	258388.6	162298.2	129.3565
2004	11411066.91	248244.6	1124157.2	133.5004
2005	14610881.45	1921.2	2394864.3	132.1470
2006	18564594.73	41119.4	2206500.5	128.6516
2007	20657317.67	109161.2	1811849.3	125.8331
2008	24296329.27	124645.0	2463370.0	118.5669
2009	24794238.66	227093.2	3927487.9	148.8802
2010	33984754.13	137029.2	2470728.5	150.2980
2011	37409860.61	125668.7	1099997.4	153.8616
2012	40544099.94	240994.4	1242324.1	157.4994
2013	42396765.70	193089.7	4352841.7	155.6805

Source: CBN Statistical Bulletin 2013

Appendix 2

Regression Results

Dependent Variable: GDP
Method: Least Squares
Date: 12/08/14 Time: 18:45
Sample: 1994 2013
Included observations: 20

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-3141228.	4616474.	-0.680439	0.5060
FDI	9.031940	29.75255	0.303569	0.7654
BOP	4.388417	1.929835	2.273985	0.0371
EXR	120763.4	57034.47	2.117376	0.0502

R-squared	0.684868	Mean dependent var	16059262
Adjusted R-squared	0.625781	S.D. dependent var	13556117
S.E. of regression	8292749.	Akaike info criterion	34.87652
Sum squared resid	1.10E+15	Schwarz criterion	35.07566
Log likelihood	-344.7652	F-statistic	11.59078
Durbin-Watson stat	0.657328	Prob(F-statistic)	0.000275

Source: Extract from E-view Econometric Software 4.0