

Investigating the Interaction between FDI and Human Capital Development on Economic Growth: Evidence from Nigeria

ONYEAGU AUGUSTINA NKECHI
aug4ever4christ@yahoo.com

Abstract

FDI among other channels by multinational corporations (MNCs) is considered to be a major channel for access to advanced technologies by developing countries. This study examines foreign direct investment, human capital development and economic growth in Nigeria within a cointegration and error-correction modelling (ECM) framework during the period (1975-2008). The main objectives of this study is to empirically examine the relationship between FDI, HCD and Economic growth in Nigeria and to ascertain the long run sustainability of FDI- induced growth process. The error correction mechanism is appealing because of its ability to induce flexibility by combing the short run and dynamic and the long run equilibrium model in a unified system. Our result show that FDI in Nigeria, has a negatively significant to growth in the long run. This suggest that the contribution of FDI in to Nigeria are small in the long run. The negative significant effect of human capital in Nigeria, with overall growth in the long run, this suggest that there is shortage of skilled labour in the country. The ECM coefficient is -0.13 and is not significant. This suggests that the speed to adjust towards equilibrium is not in moderate condition, this shows that the variables does not adjust to equilibrium value within one year. The diagnostic statistics shows that the equations are well specified. The R^2 (0.9930) and adjusted R^2 (0.9816) is very high and this fulfill the condition of goodness of fit. The F-statistics 86.9792(0.0000) is highly significant at 1% critical level, this show that there is significant relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables. The Normality test was conducted and found that the residual is normally distributed (Jaqua-Bera statistics = 0.4755(0.7884).The model specification (Reset Test) was also conducted and the result indicates that there is no misspecification present 1.6468(0.2458).This shows that the models are well specified. It is then recommended that that appropriate policy should be made to improve on the development of human capital in other to benefit more from the presence of foreign investors in to Sub-Saharan Africa countries and to Nigeria in particular, the linkages between the country and MNEs need to be strengthened.

Keywords: FDI, Human Capital Developmen, Economic Growth

INTRODUCTION

FDI among other channels by multinational corporations (MNCs) is considered to be a major channel for access to advanced technologies by developing countries. The relationship between FDI and economic growth has been an interesting area in academic discussion for a long time.

MNCs normally strive to benefit from the most advanced technology available in the industry and their great resource can help them keep their position in the market by investing in research and development, but also for generation of technological spillover from MNCs to domestic firms as Findley (1978) postulates that FDI increase the rate of technical progress in the host country through a contagion effect from the more advanced technology management practices e.t.c used by the foreign firms. Also Wang(1990) incorporated this idea into a model more in line with the neoclassical growth framework by assuming that the increase in knowledge applied to production is determined as a function of FDI.

According to the (UNCTAD)'s World investment Report (2007), global FDI inflows amounted to US\$1.352billion in 2006, rising more than 38% over the previous year. In addition the stock of FDI worldwide totaled US\$12 trillion in 2006. In 2007, the global FDI flows have reached a peak level of \$1.8 trillion (UNCTAD 2009).

For most African countries whose economics are recovering from a long stagnation after the implementation of macroeconomics reform programme, FDI inflows is much needed to accelerate growth rates to around eight or nine percent to be able to move the majority of their people out of poverty. Though many sub-Saharan African has taken steps to liberalize their environment for FDI, yet the fraction received is less than half percent of total FDI inflow to developing countries in these years. Also there had been some polices actively designed to attract investment such as tax holidays, easing of import and customs controls, infrastructure investment and labour law reform. In fact one of the pillars on which the New Partnership for Africans Development (NEPAD) was launched was to increase available capital to US\$64 billion through a combination of reforms resources mobilization and conducive environment for FDI(Funke and Nsouli 2003)

In Nigeria most FDI was concentrated in the extractive industry. In other words, it could be put that most works assessed the impact of investment in extractive industry (oil and natural resources) in Nigeria economic growth. Odsizie(1995) notes that foreign investment in Nigeria was made up of mostly ' Green field' investment, that is , it is mostly utilized for the establishment of new enterprises and some through the existing enterprises.

It is commonly believed that accumulation of human capital (HC) and availability of physical and financial

capitals are among the major determinants of economic growth; it is also widely accepted that the lack of these resources (along with the inability to expand them) are potential reasons behind the delay of many poor countries in achieving development. In other words improvement in human capital and education are essential for absorbing and adapting foreign technology and to generate sustainable long run growth. However, MNC technology may still link to the surrounding economy through external effect or spillover that raise the level of human capital in the host country and create productivity increases in local firms. The relationship between FDI and human capital is highly non-linear, and that multiple equilibria are possible, for instance, host economies with relatively high level of human capital may be able to attract large amounts of technology intensive foreign MNCs that contribute significantly to the further development of labour skills.

In a globalised world, where factors of production are increasingly mobile, the process of domestic accumulation of HC might be affected in several ways. In fact, while in principle the availability of foreign capital in the form of inward foreign direct investments (FDI) and an elastic supply of skilled (educated) workers may individually enhance growth prospects, they can also reinforce each other through possible “complementary effects”. The presence of foreign investors in the home economy can provide incentives to invest in education for both people and governments: people may want to attain higher level of education in order to access better job opportunities offered by foreign firms, and governments may want to support the accumulation of HC in order to benefit from possible spillovers of FDI (technology and knowledge transfer). In addition, a good HC endowment makes the investment climate more attractive for foreign investors, offering an educated workforce which is also likely to be associated to socio-political stability. Ideally, a virtuous circle of HC and FDI can be attained whenever «host countries experience continuous inflow of FDI over time by increasingly attracting higher value-added MNEs, while at the same time upgrading the skill contents of pre-existing MNEs and domestic enterprises»[Miyamoto (2003),]. Symmetrically, a Pareto inferior equilibrium is also possible: inadequate supply of skills discourages FDI and the lack of FDI depresses the demand for skills.

We follow the work of Borenzeta et al (1998) who examine the role of FDI in the process of technology diffusion and economic growth in developing countries. They find out that FDI has a positive effect on economic growth, but that the magnitude of the effect depends on the amount of human capital available in the host country.

This study will use endogenous model and a time series data for the analysis of the empirical application to the economy of Nigeria during the period of 1975-2008. Therefore the purpose of this paper is to empirically examine the relationship between FDI, human capital and economic growth and also to evaluate the importance of human capital to FDI as an engine for growth in Nigeria. This is achieved using co-integration techniques.

BRIEF REVIEW OF LITERATURE.

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT, HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH:

The literature on FDI can be traced to Dunning when he came up with the famous “OLI paradigm” (Ownership-Location-Internationalization), (Dunning 1988). His approach combines all the above three approaches. He pointed out that it must fulfill 3 conditions to be considered as multinational enterprises. Firstly, it must have ownership advantage which will make it profitable for the firm to relocate abroad its owned production. Secondly, there must be location advantage and then thirdly, it must have the opportunity to conveniently manage the advantages of the firm internally. This paragon was very useful to development economists in putting together different features of firm’s opportunities to become multinational and also assessing the phenomenon. Investment development path (IDP) was later developed by Dunning (1992). One of the underlying principal of the IDP is that the economic development of a country in terms of its net inward and outward investment depends on the relative competitive strengths of the domestic firms vis-a-vis MNEs in ownership and location specific advantages and their abilities to internalize cross border market transactions. . This theories would, thus help to ascertain some of the determinants of FDI inflows into developing countries and serve as a guide to the type of policies that should be developed by policy makers to attract specific kinds of FDI.

In the new growth literature, the importance of technological change for economic growth has been emphasized (Grossman and Helpman 1991; Barro and Sala-i-Martin 1995). The growth rate of the less developed countries is perceived to be lightly dependent on the extent to which these countries can adopt and implement new technology available in developed countries.

The characteristics together determine absorptive capacity of technology spillovers of the host country. In order words, FDI can only contribute to economic growth through spillover when there is a sufficient absorptive capacity in the host country and also through FDI and foreign trade flow and other externalities vis-avis the host country business sector and the direct impact on structural factor in the host country. Absorptive capacity includes types of trade regimes and the degree of openness and the level of human capital development which is the most essential in the contribution of FDI to growth.

Some other studies provide diverging results on the role of FDI spillovers with respect to stimulating economic

growth. These studies deal with the productivity effect of FDI spillovers on firms or plants using micro level data. According to Blomstrom and Wolff (1994); Kokko, (1994) Mexico, has positive effect from spillovers together with Uruguay and Indonesia. While Venezuela and Morocco have no spillover emphasizing that the reason is based on absorptive capacity between countries to adopt FDI. Some authors argues that the adoption of new technologies and management skills require inputs from the labour force. High- level capital goods need to be combined with labour that is able to understand and work with the new technology. In order words, technological spillover is possible only when there is a certain minimum or threshold level of human capital available in the host country (Borensztein et al, 1998). In effect this suggests that FDI and human capital are complementary in the process of technological diffusion.

In the developing countries, FDI seems to have a somewhat smaller effect on growth, this is attributed to the presence of “threshold externalities“. Apparently developing countries need to have reached a certain level of development in human capital (Education, health, welfare, technology and infrastructure) before being able to benefit from a foreign presence in their markets. Also weak financial intermediation hits domestic enterprises much harder than it does to multinational enterprises (MNEs).

The concept of human capital refers to the abilities and skills of human resources of a country, while human capital formation refers to the process of acquiring and increasing the number of persons who have the skills, education and experience that are critical for economic growth and development of a country (Okojie 1995). Human resources are all embracing, that is, it is inclusive of persons who works now, or are likely to be productively employed sooner or later. It is a continuum, a continuing process from childhood to old age, and a must for any society or enterprise that wishes to survive under the complex challenges of a dynamic world. Yesufu (2000), in agreement with this view, opines that “the essence of human resources development becomes one of ensuring that the workforce is continuously adapted for, and upgraded to meet, the new challenges of its total environment”. This implies that those already on the job require retraining, reorientation or adaptation to meet the new challenges. This special human capacity can be acquired and developed through education, training, health promotion, as well as investment in all social services that influence man’s productive capacities (Adamu, 2003).

The proponent of endogenous growth literature posit explicitly that human capital serves as a major driving force of technology progress and as an engine of economic growth (Romer, 1988, 1990). The endogenous growth model predicts that a permanent change in some policy variable can cause a permanent change in the economy’s growth rate. Unlike time series evidence for the U.S at first sight the data for many developing economics are broadly consistent with this prediction (Jones 1995) the endogenous growth theory acknowledges the endogenous role of human capital accumulation in economic growth and distinguishes between labour and human capital. An existing literature also recognizes human capital created through investment in education and the development of skill as one of the most significant determinant of economic growth (Shultz, 1963, Barro 1996; Barro and Sala-i-Matin, 1995).

The exogenous technical progress of the neoclassical model can change in response to policy as well. According to Parente and Prescott (2000) the choices of each country’s citizens determine how fast they raise productivity, by diverting their time from normal work to productivity-enhancing activities. In doing so, they can draw on the world stock of knowledge and borrow capital on world markets. Policy-induced constraints, such as taxation, or entry barriers at the plant level, create international differences in aggregate productivity, even when the stock of useful knowledge is common to all countries. Mankiw et al. (1992) found support for the human capital-augmented neoclassical model in a cross section of countries. But Pungo (1996) showed that the specification exhibits structural breaks, such that the coefficient on human capital is insignificant for a sample of labour-abundant countries and if influential observations are excluded. A possible reason for these last results is that schooling and health services in developing economies tend to be of low and very variable quality.

In summary, the literature on human capital ad FDI indicates that human man capital is an important determinant of FDI, especially among efficiency-seeking FDI that requires a skilled workforce as one of its key inputs. Although higher human capital does not appear to effect inflows of resources/market seeking FDI directly. It can indirectly affect FDI by improving civil liberties, health and crime rates. Basic schooling appear to be the minimal level of schooling required for FDI after then mid 1980s. Given that the tendency of FDI in recent years is towards relatively skill-intensive production and services, and less towards primary and resource-based manufacturing, basic schooling should be the absolute minimum level of education the developing countries must provide. For countries seeking to attract higher value-added MNCs, it is necessary to upgrade human capital way above the basic schooling level

EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

There exist a limited number of empirical studies of the relationship between FDI and host economic growth on the national level that employ rigorous econometrical framework. There are a large number of micro based studies such as Aitken and Harrison (1993) that analyses the productivity enhancing effect of FDI individual firms but this work focuses on macroeconomic level in analyzing the effect of FDI on economic growth.

Balasubramanyam et al (1996) analyses how FDI affects economic growth in developing economics. He uses cross-section data and OLS regressions and finds that FDI has a positive effect on economic growth in host countries using an export promoting strategy but not in countries using an import substitution strategy. Also Borensztain et al (1998) examine the role of FDI in the process of technology diffusion and economic growth, they also finds out that FDI has a positive effect on economic growth, but that the magnitude of the effect depends on the amount of human capital available in the host country.

Carkovic and Levine (2002) use a panel dataset covering 72 developed and developing countries in order to analyse the relationship between FDI inflows and economic growth. The study analysis both a cross-sectional OLS as well as dynamic panel data analysis using GMM. The paper concludes that there is no robust link running from inward FDI to host country economic growth. Bengoa and Sanchez-Robles (2003) investigate the relationship between FDI, economic freedom and economic growth using panel data for Latin America. He concludes that FDI has a significant positive effect on host country economic growth after comparing fixed and random effects estimations. Similar to Borensztein et al (1998) the magnitude depends on host country condition (human capital).

The effects of human capital on growth and productivity, export promotion, technology transfers and domestic economy have been significant through FDI. The evidence of various studies undertaken in countries which have developed human capital reveal that human capital attracted FDI and subsequently FDI impacted positively on growth and productivity, evidence from a survey of the econometric analysis on the effects of FDI provides three types of evidences: first, there are country studies that examined macroeconomic effects of attracting FDI and its impact on domestic economy and on the average level of productivity in sector in which foreign investment is made (Caves, 1974; Globerman, 1979) or on productivity in the local industry (Blomstrom and Person, 1983). Secondly, the cross-country studies find that FDI flows have been positively related with sound macroeconomic policies, per capita GDP growth or productivity (Borensztein et al. 1998). Thirdly, the econometric tests find that the productivity level of foreign firms is higher than domestic firms (Djankov and Hoekman, 2000), but the effects on productivity growth in domestic firms is mixed. As a result of foreign firms in a sector, domestic firms in the same sector could be better off as competition forces them to upgrade technologies (Blomstrom and Sjöholm, 1999). Noorbakhsh et al (2001) evidence that the impact of human capital on FDI has been statistically significant and positive. UNCTAD (2002) also finds a high correlation between human capital development and FDI inflows. Barr and Lee's (2001) also pointed out that from the mid 19180s; education increasingly turns into an important determinant in the development process and for foreign investors.

The experience of Singapore, china province, Taiwan, Ireland Costa Rica, Korea, and Malaysia suggests that these countries succeeded in attracting substantial FDI through human capital development. The economic planners of these countries recognized that skill development of their workforce is necessary for a sustained growth. Singapore used education and language policies as a vehicle to produce trained and globally competitive workforce. At the outset, a large fraction of unskilled workforce and a minuscule FDI were the core resources for their industrial development. Yet all of these countries readily realizes that the importance of foreign firm role in the economy heavy investments in human resources development and a steady supply of qualified and educated workforce, Initially, they could attract only low- value-added TNCs and with the accumulations of human capital stock these countries attracted high value- added TNCs (Kapstain 2001).

Some empirical research, suggests that firms are attracted to regions where is already high, in order words the lack of human capital may deter foreign direct investment. In spite of the need for developing countries to invest in education and training, it may be that the local educational system is simply unsuited or unable to provide the sorts of skills that multinational enterprises which are considering a foreign direct investment seek. The early study by Richman and Copen (1972) of firm performance in India, they found strong correlation "between the proportion of Western- trained (this includes formal education) local nationals employed by firms both foreign and indigenous, and the firms relative economic success. Those with the highest proportion of its trained managers and specialists have generally been the most successful in their sectors".

They also found that multinational firms (especially American) devote considerably more resources to training than do indigenous firms. Yet they asserts that the "training leaves much to be desired". While there is some evidence in support of the theory that FDI contributed to economic growth via human capital of emerging economies, its overall educational remain difficult to quality and controversy. In most developing countries, FDI still accounts for only a small proportion of the GDP and total employment and so its impact on the economy and education is unlikely to be great.

METHODOLOGY AND SPECIFICATION OF MODEL

Using a panel data, OLS multiple regression techniques will be adopted in the analysis using secondary data. These are based on endogenous Cobb-Douglas production function by Solow (1956). From our theoretical models we have that:

$$Y = K^{1-\alpha} (AhL)^{\alpha} \quad \text{In equation} \quad (1)$$

Since we have assumed the Cobb-Douglas production function, A is related to the total factor productivity which

explains the output growth that is not accounted for by the growth in the factor of production specified. We take the log of the standard augmented Solow model, the following equation is obtained:

$$GDPPCAP = f(\text{,} FDI, LA, HUMCAP, DI, INFR, OPP, INFL, POLINST)$$

Where:

GDPPCAP = Real Gross Domestic Product per capita (in log form)

FDI = Foreign Direct Investment defined as (FDI/GDP* 100)

LA = Labour measured as the labour participation rate.

HUMCAP = Level of human capital (adult literate and health)

DI = Domestic investment (Gross Fixed capital formation (FCF/GDP* 100)

INFR = Infrastructure development (per capita electricity production and Telephone line)

OPP = Openness of the economy (total trade- GDP ratio.)

INFL = Rate of inflation

Specifically, given the time series nature of the data, the postulated long run model is

Model

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LogGDPPCAP} = & \text{Log}8_0 + \text{Log}8_1 FDI + \text{Log}8_2 HUMCAP + \text{Log}8_3 LA + \text{Log}8_4 DI \\ & + \text{Log}8_5 INFR + \text{Log}8_6 OPP + \text{Log}8_7 INFL + e_i \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

EMPIRICAL OF RESULT

Insert table 1 Here → The summary statistics of the country Nigeria

Insert table 2 Here → Test for Unit Root (order of integration). Any of the forms of this test presume the existence of white noise errors in the regression. If that is implausible, the test will lose significant power. To cope with this issue, any of the ‘Dickey–Fuller’ tests in practice are usually employed as the ‘augmented Dickey–Fuller’ test, or ADF test, in which a number of lags of the dependent variable are added to the regression to whiten the errors. Therefore using Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) and Phillips-Peron unit root test we test for the presence of unit roots in the variables of the country. The table (2) found in the appendix shows that some of the variables such as LNINFL and LNFDI are stationary at level, in ADF while all other variables are integrated of order one. Also in PP LNGDPPCAP, LNFDI are stationary at level and all other variables are stationary at first difference. It also shows that the variables are mostly greater than 5% critical values. We now accept the null hypothesis of non-stationary for the entire test.

Insert table 3 Here

In table 3 which is correlation matrix, we examine the relationship among the variables. The result of the correlation matrix for the country Nigeria are reported in table (3). The table shows that most of the variables are correlated, except LNGDPPCAP that has no correlation; all other variables have traces of correlation in them.

Insert table 4 Here

The next is the cointegration test, according to Baharumshali et al (2005), the development of cointegration analysis allows for another approach to examine the relationship between fundamental variables. A set of variables are said to be cointegrated if they are integrated of the same order and a linear combination of them is stationary. Such a linear combination would then posit to the existence of a long-term relationship among the variables (Johanson and Juselius 1990). Cointegration variables move together over time so that any short run deviation from the long-term trend will be corrected. The test for number of cointegrating vectors in the JJ procedure can be conducted using two likelihood ratio (LR) test statistics namely the trace statistics and maximum Eigen value statistics. The cointegration table for Nigeria is shown in table(4) The result shows that Trace test indicates 3 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level and the Max-Eigen value test indicates 4 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level for Growth-FDI Model, while the Trace test for FDI-HCD Model indicates 3 cointegrating eqn(s) at 0.05 level and the max-Eigen value test indicates 2 cointegrating eqn(s) at 0.05 level.

Insert table 5 Here

We then test for the long run normalized coefficient of growth-FDI model which is known as long run equilibrium estimates and its multiplied by 1 in table(5). From the result FDI has a negative estimated coefficient and it is statically significant which means that there is a significant relationship between FDI and economic growth but the magnitude of the coefficient is small. This implies that there are lapses in the area of attracting FDI into the country, therefore there should be improvement in the major determinant of FDI so as to attract more FDI especially in other sectors, because FDI in Nigeria is mainly channeled to oil sectors. It also means that any 1 percent increases in FDI will course a decrease in GDPPCAP. Equally all other variables have negative estimated coefficient and also have significant relationship with growth, only that their impact is very small.

Human capital variable proxy by adult literacy has a negative estimated coefficient and it is statistically significant. This means that there is significant relationship between Human capital and growth, but the magnitude of significance is very low. Following the work of Obwona (2004), one of the conditions for location of efficiency-seeking FDI is that there is ample supply of skilled and well disciplined labour, he notes that though there are cheap labours in Africa, yet there are shortage of highly skilled labours. The lack of middle or

senior level entrepreneurial experience has increased the existing skill gap, and many foreign companies have resorted to employment of expatriate managers (Bhinda et al., 1999). This is also the case in Nigeria, where foreign companies and many conglomerates prefer expatriates as their senior managers. The companies only hire Nigerians on the condition of retraining and mostly this training is done outside the country. As Adeolu (2007) indicates in his findings show that the mean of the measure of human capital obtained for Nigeria is very low relative to that of the sub-Saharan African Countries.

Inflation (INFL) used as a proxy for macroeconomic instability, has a negative coefficient and has a significant relationship with growth, which conforms to the theory that lower inflation positively effects the economic growth. The lower inflation rate will increase the purchasing power per income, while higher inflation rate will erode the purchasing power of income. In other words an unstable macroeconomic environment discourages growth. Borensztein et al. (1998) and Li and Liu (2004) also reported an indirect relationship between inflation and growth.

Openness has a negative coefficient and a significant relationship with economic growth, though some previous result like Asiedo (2001) reported positive relationship of trade with economic growth. In this work, the number of years covered in the analysis varies and the result here shows a very low significant relationship between trade and per capita GDP growth.

Insert Table 6 Here→

In the error correction mechanism, the short-run coefficient of growth was estimated following the general to specific approach, given the fact that the number of observation is not very large; the lag structure was restricted to a maximum period of three years. Insignificant lags were eliminated and the most parsimonious error correction mechanism for the effect of FDI on growth. For the purpose of this work we will use the Lagrange multiplier test (LM) for serial correlation. The short run analysis on FDI and Growth show that most of the independent variables had the expected relationship with the dependent variable GDPPCAP and almost all the variable entered are statistically significant except Human capital(HUMCAP(-1) that is statistically insignificant. DFDI (-2)(-3) has a positive estimated coefficients and significant relationship with economic growth at 1percent respectively. This means that changes in FDI do matter for growth. The result implies that a one- standard deviation increase in the variable would raise the growth rate on impact. DHUMCAP(-1) has a negative estimated coefficient and it has statistically insignificant relationship with growth, meaning that in lag (-1), the quality of human capital in Nigeria cannot induce growth. For any significant contribution of human capital to economic growth, there is need for conscious development in a new and innovative way (Otepolo 2002). In lag 3 ie HUMCAP(-3) has a positive estimated coefficient and a significant relationship with economic growth which also means that one standard deviation increase in the variable would raise the growth rate. The ECM coefficient is -0.13 and is not significant. This suggests that the speed to adjust towards equilibrium is not in moderate condition, this shows that the variables does not adjust to equilibrium value within one year.

The diagnostic statistics shows that the equations are well specified. The R^2 (0.9930) and adjusted R^2 (0.9816) is very high and this fulfill the condition of goodness of fit. The F-statistics 86.9792(0.0000) is highly significant at 1% critical level, this show that there is significant relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables.

The Normality test was conducted and found that the residual is normally distributed (Jaqua-Bera statistics = 0.4755(0.7884).The model specification (Reset Test) was also conducted and the result indicates that there is no misspecification present 1.6468(0.2458).This shows that the models are well specified..

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS

It was found out that Nigeria has negatively significant effect on growth in the long run, which implies that FDI potentials are very small, may be due to inadequate development in the needed areas to attract FDI and more so the available FDI in Nigeria is channeled to the oil sector. Therefore there is need to put up an appropriate policy that will help develop other sectors of the economy. Also HUMCAP has negative significant effect on growth meaning that the potentials of human capital are very small and cannot induce growth. This implies that appropriate policy should be made to improve on the development of human capital.

In order to benefit more from the presence of foreign investors in to Sub-Saharan Africa countries and to Nigeria in particular, the linkages between the country and MNEs need to be strengthened, currently, domestic firms capabilities are inadequate with respect to offering high-quality products the MNEs would like to source domestically. They also lack the capacity to benefit from technological spillover, in order words it is useful to develop a national technology strategy that would focus on the main sectors for development, and then involve all parties concern with science and technology. These will be of benefits to the country in that such programme could raise the awareness of the value of technological knowledge by starting with the analysis of the current strength and weakness bringing fort the most priority sectors in question and then setting up an action plan that will enhance commitment by stake holders and the mobilization of resources. Following our literature on FDI and growth, all the important pre-requisites for positive FDI and growth should be met, in other to increase the benefits of FDI in Nigeria as well as other developing countries. While some of these countries have already

liberalized its external sectors significantly, there is still room for improvement in important policy areas. Mostly in the area of financial sectors and human capital development in the country, which are the main sector to encourage the growth effect of FDI and the development of the economy.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study examines foreign direct investment, human capital development and economic growth in developing countries: evidence from Nigeria within a cointegration and error-correction modeling (ECM) framework during the period (1975-2008). The main objectives of this study is to empirically examine the relationship between FDI and GDP growth in Nigeria, also to assess empirically the long run sustainability of FDI- induced growth process. Data were collected from secondary sources analysed with the aim of achieving these objectives. The error correction mechanism is appealing because of its ability to induce flexibility by combining the short run and dynamic and the long run equilibrium model in a unified system. We found the cointegration approach of Johanson and Juselius and its error correction model the most appropriate model for the estimation of the function based on its advantage of determining long run relationship. Moreover investment that will generate sustainable growth is a long run phenomenon therefore it requires a long run consideration.

REFERENCE

- Borensztein, E., J. DE Gregorio and J.W. Lee (1998), "How Does Foreign Direct Investment Affect Economic Growth?" *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 45, Issue 1, June, pp.115-135.
- Barro, R.J. and Sala-i-Martin, X. (1995), *Economic growth*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Advanced Series in Economics.
- Blomström, M., and E.N. Wolff (1994), "Multinational Corporations and Productivity Convergence in Mexico", in: W. Baumol, R. Nelson, and E.N. Wolff (eds.), *Convergence of Productivity: Cross-National Studies and Historical Evidence*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Balasubramanyam, V.N., M. Salisu, and D. Sapsford (1996), "Foreign Direct Investment and Growth in EP and IS Countries", *The Economic Journal*, Vol.106, No.1, pp.92-105.
- Bengoa, M. and Sanchez-Robles, B. (2003), Foreign direct investment, economic freedom and growth: new evidence from Latin America, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 19, 529-545
- Blomström, M., and H. Persson (1983), 'Foreign Investment and Spillover Efficiency in an Underdeveloped Economy: Evidence from the Mexican Manufacturing Industry', *World Development*, Vol.11, No.6, pp.493-501.
- Blomstrom, M. and F. Sjöholm. (1999). "Technological transfer and spillover: Does local participation with multinationals matter?" *European Economic Review*, 43: 915-23.
- Adeolu, B. A. (2007) "Foreign Direct Investment and Economic growth": Evidence from Nigeria: African Economic Research Consortium, Research Paper 165
- Asiedu, E. 2001. "On the determinants of foreign direct investment to developing countries: Is Africa different?" *World Development*, 30(1): 107-19.
- Bhinda, N., S.Griffith-Jones and M. Martin. 1999. *Private Capital Flows to Africa: Perception and Reality*. The Hague: FONDAD.
- Aitken, B. and Harrison, A. (1999), Do domestic firms benefit from direct foreign investment? Evidence from Venezuela, *American Economic Review*, 89(3), 605-618
- Caves, R. E. (1974), "Multinational Firms, Competition and productivity in Host- Country Markets", *Economica*, Vol, 41, pp.176-193.
- Djankov, S. and B. Hoekman. (2000). Foreign Investment and Productivity Growth in Czech Enterprises. *World Bank Economic Review*. 14 (1). pp. 49-64.
- Dunning, J.H. (1988), "The eclectic paradigm International Production", A restatement and some possible extensions, *Journal of international business studies*. 19:1-31
- Dunning, J.H. (1992), *Multinational enterprises and the global economy* Working ham Addison Wesley
- Grossman, G.M., and E. Helpman (1991), *Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Funke, N., and S. M. Nsouli (2003). "The New Partnership for Africa's Development: Opportunities and Challenges". IMF Working Paper 03/69. Washington, DC: IMF.
- Findlay, R. (1978). "Relative backwardness, direct foreign investment and the transfer of technology: A simple dynamic model". *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 92: 1-16.
- Kokko, A. (1994). "Technology, market characteristics and spillovers". *Journal of Development Economics*, 43: 279-93.
- Globerman, S. (1979). "Foreign direct investment and spillover efficiency benefit in Canadian manufacturing industries". *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 12: 42-56.
- Kapstain, E.B (2001). "Vicious circle? Human Capital Formation, Economic Development and the Multinational enterprise". A Paper Presented to the OECD Conference on Foreign Direct Investment, Human Capital, and Education in Developing countries .December.
- Richman, Barry and Melvin Copen. (1972). *International Management and Economic*

Development. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Solow, R. M. (1956). "A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth". *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 70(1):65-94.

Noorbakhsh, F., A. Paloni and A. Youssef (2001), 'Human Capital and FDI inflows to Developing Countries: New Empirical Evidence', *World Development*, 29, pp. 1593–1610.

Johanson, S. And Juselius, K.(1990). "Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference cointegration with Application to the Demand for money". Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, Vol 52 pp 169-210

Otepolo, Ayorinde. 2002. *FDI as a Factor of Economic Growth in Nigeria*. Dakar, Senegal: African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP), May. Available on line from idep@unidep.org, http://unidep.org.

Obwona, Marios B. (2004). "Foreign direct investment in Africa". In *Financing Pro-Poor Growth: AERC Senior Policy Seminar VI, Kampala, Uganda, 2–4 March 2004 – Seminar Papers*, pp. 60–95. Nairobi: African Economic Research Consortium.

Odozi, V.A.(1995). *An Overview of Foreign Investment in Nigeria 1960-1995*. Occasional Paper No. 11. Research Department, Central Bank of Nigeria, in Adeolu , B. A. (2007)

Okojie, C.E.E (1995). Human Capital Formation for Productivity Growth in Nigeria. *Nigerian Economic and Financial Review*: June pp. 44-5.

Yesufu, T.M. (2000). *The Human Factor in National Development: Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Schultz, T.W. (1963) *The Economic value of Education*. (Columbia: Columbia University press).

Parente, S. and E. Prescott, (2000). Barriers to Riches. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Mankiw, N. Gregory, David Romer, David N. Weil (1992). A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107: 408- 437.

Miyamoto Koji (2003): "Human capital Formation and Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries". Research Programme on Empowering People to Meet the Challenges of Globalisation. No 09 July. www.oecd.org/dev/technics.

Pungo, Maurizio, (1996). Structural stability in a cross country neoclassical growth model. *Applied Economics*, 28, 1555-1566.

Adamu, P.A. (2003). The Impact of Human Capital formation on Economic Development in Nigeria: An Error correction Approach. In: *Human Resource Development in Africa: Selected Papers for the Year 2002 Annual Conference, The Nigerian Economic Society (NES), Part Two*, pp.53-77.

Romer, P. M. (1990) "Endogenous technological change". *Journal of Political Economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Vol. 98, issue 5, p. S71-S102.

Jones, C. I.(1995)," R&D-based models of economic growth" . *Journal of Political economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Vol. 103, issue 4, p. 759-784.

Wang, J. Y. (1990). Growth, Technology Transfer, and the Long-Run Theory of International Capital Movements. *Journal of International Economics*. 29 (3–4). pp. 255–271.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1: SUMMARY STATISTICS OF THE COUNTRY NIGERIA
NIGERIA .

	MEAN	MADIAN	MAXIMUM	MINIMUM	STD.DEV
LNGDPPCAP	2.683928	2.826692	3.176704	-0.757934	0.680809
LNFDI (FDI/GDP* 100)	0.004600	0.002240	0.022600	-0.022002	0.007834
LNHUMCAP	3.914346	3.951244	4.112512	3.756108	0.114159
LNDI(domestic Investment)	-14.01282	-13.93407	-10.84012	-17.31277	2.219464
INFL(inflation)	2.788669	2.674822	4.288204	1.683102	0.739046
INFR(infrastructure)	-5.683804	-5.792455	-4.448181	-6.342961	0.533312
LNLA(labour)	4.028149	4.026244	4.044804	4.016383	0.008478
LNOPP(openness)	-2.578934	-2.687301	0.326999	-4.954926	2.008356

Table 2: (NIGERIA): Unit Root Test at Ordinary and First Difference

Variables	Level(no trend)	Level(with trend)	1 st diff (no trend)	1stdif f(with trend)
ADF				
<i>LNGDPPCAP</i>	-2.280104	-3.135326	-3.537830**	-3.500549**
<i>LN(FDI)</i>	-1.998955	-3.226069***	-10.63394*	-13.21115*
<i>LNHUMCAP</i>	-0.921641	-2.512127	-5.885593*	-5.764899*
<i>LNDI</i>	-1.139335	-2.649708	-5.849190*	-5.790344*
<i>LNINFL</i>	-3.369341**	-3.326994***	-5.726353*	-5.641561*
<i>LNINFR</i>	0.928154	2.295686	-2.681590***	-4.343997*
<i>LNLA</i>	-1.554453	-1.420125	-3.338898**	-3.361889***
<i>Critical Values</i>				
1% level	-3.670170	-4.323979	-3.679322	-4.309824
5% level	-2.963972	-3.580623	-2.967767	-3.574244
10% level	-2.621007	-3.225334	-2.622989	-3.221728
PP				
<i>LNGDPPCAP</i>	-5.148668*	-5.581391*	-11.75011*	-11.67627*
<i>LN(FDI)</i>	-4.994751*	-9.316472*	-22.81888*	-33.08790*
<i>LNHUMCAP</i>	-0.660434	-2.512127	-5.973439*	-5.820070*
<i>LNDI</i>	-0.915683	-2.702527	-6.407005*	-6.682712*
<i>LNINFL</i>	-2.832546	-2.790191	-9.945584*	-10.02929*
<i>LNINFR</i>	-0.023566	-1.602558	-3.145702**	-3.217541***
<i>LNLA</i>	-1.394071	-1.318267	-3.247541**	-3.273867***
<i>Critical Values</i>				
1% level	-3.646342	-4.262735	-3.653730	-4.273277
5% level	-2.954021	-3.552973	-2.957110	-3.557759
10% level	2.615817	-3.209642	-2.617434	-3.212361

Note: * denotes significant at 1%, ** denotes significant at 5%, and *** denotes significant at 10%

TABLE 3: CORRELATION MATRIX

	<i>LNGDPPCAP</i>	<i>LNFDI</i>	<i>LNHUMCAP</i>	<i>LNDI</i>	<i>LNINFL</i>	<i>LNINFR</i>	<i>LNLA</i>	<i>LNOPP</i>
<i>LNGDPPCAP</i>	1.000000							
<i>LNFDI</i>	-0.288517	1.000000						
<i>LNHUMCAP</i>	0.299122	-0.539868	1.000000					
<i>LNDI</i>	0.323998	-0.395880	0.681323	1.000000				
<i>LNINFL</i>	-0.076713	0.105706	-0.054008	-0.349571	1.000000			
<i>LNINFR</i>	0.386921	-0.376218	0.634517	0.701699	-0.232356	1.000000		
<i>LNLA</i>	-0.455306	0.421292	-0.693930	-0.282854	-0.350713	-0.310474	1.000000	
<i>LNOPP</i>	-0.415125	0.425565	-0.752955	-0.532153	-0.127436	-0.537268	0.778990	1.000000

Table 4 Johnsen and Juselius Cointegration Result of Growth - FDI Model and FDI-HCD Model. Trend assumption: Linear Deterministic Trend

NIGERIA

	Trace Statistics (Growth-FDI)	(8 Max) Max-eigen Staistic (Growth-FDI)	Trace stat (FDI-HCD)	(8 Max) Max-eigen stati (FDI-HCD)	0.05 Critical value(Trace)	0.05Critical value(Max)	
$r=0$	=1	285.0869*	111.2363*	281.2272*	107.9879*	159.5297	52.36261
$rR1$	=2	173.8507*	69.10297*	173.2393*	67.51141*	125.6154	46.23142
$rR2$	=3	104.7477*	44.53310*	105.7279*	38.7594	95.75366	40.07757
$rR3$	=4	60.21458	36.98291*	67.01192	27.09808	69.81889	33.87687
$rR4$	=5	23.23167	13.82762	39.91384	21.45169	47.85613	27.58434
$rR5$	=6	9.404058	7.816406	18.46215	10.98364	29.79707	21.13162
$rR6$	=7	1.587652	1.524238	7.478504	5.65904	15.49471	14.26460
$rR7$	=8	0.063415	0.063415	1.819490	1.819490	3.841466	3.841466

*Denotes rejection of the hypothesis at the 0.05 level. Trace test indicates 3 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level and the Max-Eigen value test indicates 4 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05level for Growth-FDI Model, while the Trace test for FDI-HCD Model indicates 3 cointegrating eqn(s) at 0.05 level and the max-Eigen value test indicates 2 cointegrating eqn(s) at 0.05 level.

- 0.151602*

TABLE 5: LONGRUN NORMALIZED COEFFICIENTS OF GROWTH-FDI MODEL

COUNTRIES/ VARIABLES	LNGDPPCAP	LNFDI	LNHUMCAP	LNDI	LNINFL	LNINFR	LNLA	LNOPP
NIGERIA	-1	-8.035180* (2.99793)	-3.683766* (0.66291)	-0.02883 (0.03258)	-0.205102* (0.04495)	-0.037974 (0.08833)	-57.12570* (5.86354)	-0.1516020 (0.04413)

TABLE (6) SHORT RUN PARSIMONIOUS GROWTH-- FDI Model (Dependent variable:Dgdppcap)

Variable	Coefficient	Std-Error	t-Statistics	Probability
<i>C</i>	-0.219861	0.062335	-3.52705	0.0047
<i>DGDPPCAP(-1)</i>	-2.045314	0.062335	-11.23488	0.0000
<i>DGDPPCAP(-2)</i>	-1.890286	0.182050	-13.62868	0.0000
<i>DGDPPCAP(-3)</i>	-0.091660	0.138699	1.324039	0.2123
<i>DFDI(-2)</i>	66.34655	6.970332	9.518420	0.0000
<i>DFDI(-3)</i>	121.1639	7.309775	16.57560	0.0000
<i>DHUMCAP(-1)</i>	-1.658976	1.069610	-1.551011	0.1492
<i>DHUMCAP(-3)</i>	1.294913	0.675290	1.917567	0.0815
<i>DDI(-2)</i>	0.345064	0.059133	5.835408	0.0001
<i>DDI(-3)</i>	0.111068	0.050954	2.179742	0.0519
<i>DINFL(-3)</i>	-0.181939	0.067445	-2.697574	0.0207
<i>DINFR(-2)</i>	-1.565937	0.366023	-4.278245	0.0013
<i>DINFR(-3)</i>	3.465596	0.421856	8.215125	0.0000
<i>DLA(-1)</i>	-381.2711	29.85752	-12.76969	0.0000
<i>DLA(-2)</i>	132.0990	21.71262	6.115238	0.0001
<i>DLA(-3)</i>	212.4886	21.71262	9.786410	0.0000
<i>DOPP(-1)</i>	-0.378352	0.131047	-2.887155	0.0148
<i>DOPP(-2)</i>	-0.850053	0.1165696	-5.130193	0.0003
<i>ECM(-1)</i>	-0.131997	0.170233	-0.775391	0.4545
R-Squared	0.993023	Reset Test		
Adjusted R-Squared	0.981606	<i>F-statistics</i>	1.646758	
F-Statistics	86.97915	<i>Probability</i>	0.245781	
Probability(F-stat)	0.000000	LM Test		
Normality Test		<i>F-statistics</i>	0.646758	
Jaque-Bera	0.475548	<i>Probability</i>	0.566491	
Probability	0.245781			