

# Does Energy Consumption, Economic Growth, and Foreign Direct Investment Contribute to CO<sub>2</sub> Emission? Evidence from Bangladesh

Md. Azharul Islam<sup>1</sup> Mahbubur Rahman<sup>2</sup> Md. Shaddam Hossain<sup>2\*</sup> Md. Iqbal Hossain<sup>3</sup>  
Habiba Sultana<sup>1</sup>

1.Department of Economics, Noakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh

2.Lecturer, Department of Economics, Noakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh

3.Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Noakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh

## Abstract

This work used the Johansen Cointegration Test and the Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) cointegration methodology to assess the long-run cointegrating relationship and short-run dynamics in Bangladesh between energy consumption economic growth, foreign direct investment, urbanization, population growth, and carbon emissions. To assess the long-term association between these variables, we examined data from 1972 to 2014, and empirical estimation revealed that all factors are significant at the 1% level of significance in the case of Bangladesh. Thus, energy consumption, economic growth, foreign direct investment, urbanization, population growth, and carbon emissions all have shown the predicted sign and are statistically significant, indicating that increased energy consumption, gross domestic product, and population increase all are responsible for increased carbon emissions in Bangladesh. Higher FDI inflows, on the other hand, cut per capita carbon emissions in Bangladesh. On the other hand, the empirical outcome has revealed that there is no substantial causal association between carbon emissions and urbanization.

**Keywords:** CO<sub>2</sub>; FDI; GDP; population growth; energy consumption; VECM

**DOI:** 10.7176/JESD/12-12-05

**Publication date:** June 30<sup>th</sup> 2021

## 1. Introduction

Over the past several decades, the most critical global issues are air pollution and global warming. We considered carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions as one of the major causes of these problems. Intergovernmental panels on Climate Change (IPCC) (2013) highlighted the role of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. According to the research, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions account for around 76.7 percent of GHG emissions. Emerging nations aim to raise their national output and accelerate their development rates to improve their economic conditions. As a result, knowing the reasons for emerging nations' CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is critical for policymakers. According to the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) hypothesis, economic growth and environmental pollution have a reversed U-shaped connection. According to this theory, environmental contamination rises in the early phases of economic development before declining in the later stages (Ozturk and Acaravci 2010). The association between environmental toxins and economic growth using the EKC hypothesis has been widely examined in the energy economics literature throughout the last era (e.g., Alam et al. 2016). However, there is a paucity of research on applying the EKC to nations with different characteristics such as energy consumption, population growth, urbanization, and foreign direct investments (FDI). Foreign direct investment (FDI) is critical to the economic progress of emerging nations that lack adequate resources to invest. FDI helps developing countries expand economically not just by providing cash but also by increasing productivity by transferring superior manufacturing technologies, management skills, and know-how to modernize the economy and foster innovation. FDI also offers new employment opportunities and promotes entrepreneurship and competitiveness, which are critical instruments for developing nations' rapid growth (Mallampally and Sauvart 1999; Hermes and Lensink 2003; Batten and Vo 2009; Reiter and Steensma 2010; Fernandes and Paunov 2012; Lee et al. 2013). FDI may have a variety of effects on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and environmental degradation, and there have been continuing debates over the net impact of FDI on pollution. According to some studies, FDI contributes to environmental conservation. Being damaging FDI may be transmitted inefficient industrial technologies, which can assist countries in minimizing air pollution (Stretesky and Lynch 2009).

Many other researchers, on the other hand, think that FDI adds to air pollution. They claim that FDI boosts economic growth by improving productivity, which leads to increased energy consumption. Therefore, environmental contamination results from increased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as a result of increased energy use. On the other hand, superior foreign technology can serve as a model for the technical growth of the local market through presentation, imitation, and other means. Therefore, we can also cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by employing this ecologically beneficial technology.

Furthermore, polluting companies may opt to invest in developing nations with lax environmental restrictions

to reduce production costs, resulting in a rise in the country's energy consumption (Jensen 1996; Acharyya 2009; Lau, Choong, and Eng 2014). As a result, weak environmental restrictions that allow businesses to expand their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions may entice overseas investors, increasing FDI inflow. This link is formalized by the pollution haven hypothesis. The purpose of this study is to find out more about the long-term equilibrium link between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, economic development, energy consumption, population increase, urbanization, and foreign direct investment in Bangladesh, which is an energy-dependent growing nation.

To our knowledge, many studies investigate the interactions between CO<sub>2</sub> emission, economic growth, and FDI in Bangladesh. But in our work, we try to include some more important variables like population growth and urbanization, which makes our work sounder. Many are using the ARDL approach; many are using the VECM approach depends on their variable. If all variable is stationary at level ( $I_0$ ), then we use OLS. When all variables are stationary at the first difference ( $I_1$ ), we use the cointegration test. If found cointegration, then we use the VECM approach. However, when we face some stationary variables at level ( $I_0$ ), and some are stationary at the first difference ( $I_1$ ), we use the ARDL bound testing approach. The following sections address empirical research from the literature.

## 2. Literature Review

When fossil fuels are burnt, carbon dioxide is released, which may contribute to long-term climate change, according to Stoker and Judson (1995), who used reduced-form models to forecast climate change through 2050 using national-level panel data from 1950 to 1990. They discovered an actual 'Inverse U' relationship between carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption per capita and per capita income.

Using an updated and revised panel data set, Harbaugh, Levinson, and Wilson (2000) evaluated the sensitivity of the pollution-income connection to functional forms, new variables, and changes within nations, cities, and years. They also discovered that the results are pretty sensitive to such modifications, concluding that there is no empirical support in these data for an inverted U-shaped link between numerous significant air contaminants and national wealth.

ARDL (autoregressive distributed lag) bounds testing approach was used to assess cointegration, Hossain and Hasanuzzaman (2012) investigated the long-run cointegrating relationship and short-run dynamics among carbon emissions energy consumption, economic growth, urbanization, financial development, and trade openness in Bangladesh from 1975 to 2010. At a 1% significance level, the research claimed a long-run link between the variables in Bangladesh. Energy consumption and urbanization have a positive influence on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per capita, whereas real GDP per capita has a negative influence, and financial development and trade openness have no effect.

Shahbaz et al. (2014, 2015) used the Zivot-Andrews unit root test and the ARDL limits testing strategy, as well as the VECM Granger causality methodology and the causal analysis' robustness, to investigate the links between economic growth, energy consumption, financial development, trade openness, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Indonesia from 1975:Q1 to 2011:Q4. According to empirical research, economic expansion and energy use raise CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, but financial development and trade openness reduce them.

Using the Granger Causality Test and Variance Decomposition Analysis, Akhmat et al. (2014) investigated the causative link between energy consumption and environmental pollution for the chosen South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) nations from 1975 to 2011. These findings suggest that energy use is a major contributor to rising pollution levels in SAARC nations. Begum et al. (2014) used the ARDL Bound Test, DOLS Test, and SLM U test to look at the dynamic effects of GDP growth, energy consumption, and population expansion on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Malaysia from 1970 to 1980. The article found that per capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions fell as per capita GDP (economic growth) grew; but, between 1980 and 2009, per capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions climbed dramatically as per capita GDP climbed. The findings also show that per capita energy consumption and per capita GDP have a positive long-term influence on per capita carbon emissions. The population growth rate, on the other hand, had no substantial influence on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per capita.

Dogan and Turkekul (2015) used limits testing for cointegration to analyze the link between carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, energy consumption, real output (GDP), the square of real output (GDP<sup>2</sup>), trade openness, urbanization, and financial development in the United States from 1960 to 2010. They discovered that energy use and urbanization contribute to environmental damage in the long run. At the same time, it was unaffected by financial development, and commerce led to environmental benefits. The creation of appropriate energy policy is expected to lead to decreased CO<sub>2</sub> emissions while having no negative impact on actual production. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, energy consumption, economic development, and foreign direct investment (FDI) are all used as factors, Gokmenoglu & Taspinar (2015) explored the applicability of the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) hypothesis in Turkey over the period 1974–2010 using the ARDL bound test and Toda-Yamamoto causality test. They discovered that the contribution of energy consumption, economic growth, and FDI causes CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to converge to their long-run equilibrium level at a 49.2 percent annual rate of adjustment.

Azam (2016) used classic panel estimate approaches covering fixed and random factors, as well as the results

of Hausman's test, to study the influence of environmental degradation caused by CO<sub>2</sub> emissions on economic development in 11 Asian nations between 1990 and 2011. Due to the nature of the data, classic panel estimation approaches covering fixed and random effects were used. Environmental deterioration has a considerable detrimental influence on economic growth, according to empirical evidence, which is why he believes it should be regulated.

Khobai & Roux (2017) used yearly data from 1971 to 2013 to study the link between energy consumption, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, economic development, trade openness, and urbanization in South Africa. According to Johansen's cointegration test, there is a long-run link in South Africa between energy consumption, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, economic development, trade openness, and urbanization. The VECM findings also revealed a unidirectional causation running from CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, economic growth, trade openness, and urbanization to energy consumption, as well as a unidirectional causation running from CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, economic growth, trade openness, and urbanization to economic growth. Rahman and Kashem (2017) used the ARDL Bounds Testing technique and the Granger Causality test in an enhanced VAR framework to investigate the empirical cointegration, long and short-run dynamics, and causal linkages between carbon emissions, energy consumption, and industrial growth in Bangladesh from 1972 to 2011. The findings reveal that, both in the short and long term, industrial production and energy consumption have a major positive influence on carbon emissions. That is to say, Bangladesh's industrial or economic growth is occurring at the expense of environmental quality.

### 3. Data and Methodology

#### 3.1 Data

This study used Time series data from 1972 to 2014, derived from the World Bank's 2019 World Development Indicators dataset. We take data from 1972-2014 because our dependent variable available only till 2014. The vector of variables included Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emission (metric tons per capita), Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (constant 2010 US\$), Energy (ENG) use (kg of oil equivalent per capita), Foreign direct investment (FDI), net inflows (% of GDP), Population growth (POPG) (annual %) and Urban population (UR) (% of total population). ENG, FDI, POPG, UR were included as control variables.

Every variable was in its natural log form. The estimates and analysis were carried out using the statistical program E-views 10.

#### 3.2 Methodology

We analyzed the interaction between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, FDI, GDP, population growth, and urbanization in Bangladesh using a time-series approach with the vector autoregressive regression. Our study differs remarkably from the previous work running the unit root and cointegration tests. It also argues from the position mentioned above that it ignores structural changes in the series, whereas our research employed various variables and case studies. The following is a functional representation of the link between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, economic growth, energy consumption, FDI, population growth, and urban population:

$$\ln CO_{2,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln GDP_t + \beta_2 \ln ENG_t + \beta_3 \ln FDI_t + \beta_4 \ln POPG_t + \beta_5 \ln UR_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

Where,  $\ln CO_{2,t}$ ,  $\ln GDP_t$ ,  $\ln ENG_t$ ,  $\ln FDI_t$ ,  $\ln POPG_t$ , and  $\ln UR_t$  are the logarithmic forms of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, gross domestic product, energy consumption, foreign direct investment, population growth, and urban population, respectively.

We have further used the Breusch-Godfrey LM test for serial correlation and the Jarque-Bera test for the normality assumption of residuals for our model specification. Therefore, to avoid spurious correlation among variables of interest, which would affect our results and conventional statistical inference, the first concern is determining whether the time series for the variables used are cointegrated processes. In this respect, the following section will describe the unit root tests and then cointegration tests.

### 4. Econometric Tests

#### 4.1 Unit root tests

A fundamental unit root attribute exists for most macroeconomic time series variables (Nelson and Plosser 1982). So, using the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test, the initial step would have been to examine the variability of the mean and variance of the variables across time (Dickey and Fuller 1979). Cointegration tests would then be performed once all variables had been integrated into the same sequence (Engle and Granger 1991).

#### 4.2 Vector Error Correction Model

If there is at least one cointegration equation between the exogenous and endogenous variables, it would be applied vector error correction model. The restricted, generalized least squares (GLS) approach depicts both long-run and

short-run dynamic relationships. These constraints are put in place to ensure accuracy and a more reliable estimate. The following is a representation of the model:

$$\Delta \ln CO_{2,t} = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \Delta \ln CO_{2,t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^n \delta_i \Delta \ln GDP_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^n \gamma_i \Delta \ln ENG_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^n \eta_i \Delta \ln FDI_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i \Delta \ln POPG_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^n \tau_i \Delta \ln UR_{t-i} + \varphi z_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

The OLS residuals from the following long-run cointegrating regression are represented by z, which is the error correction term.

$$\ln CO_{2,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln GDP_t + \beta_2 \ln ENG_t + \beta_3 \ln FDI_t + \beta_4 \ln POPG_t + \beta_5 \ln UR_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (3)$$

and is define as,

$$Z_{t-1} = ECT_{t-1} = \ln CO_{2,t} - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \ln GDP_t - \beta_2 \ln ENG_t - \beta_3 \ln FDI_t - \beta_4 \ln POPG_t - \beta_5 \ln UR_t \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\varepsilon_t$  is the white noise stochastic disturbance term in this model, with as the differencing notation. The phrase "error correction" refers to how the past period's divergence from long-run equilibrium (the error) affects the dependent variables' short-run dynamics. The speed of adjustment is measured by the coefficient of ECT, which indicates how quickly Y recovers to equilibrium after a change in X. The calculated model's suitability was verified using residual analysis, particularly for serial correlation and normalcy assumptions.

### 5. Empirical analysis of estimated results

A unit root test was conducted according to Elliot et al. (1992), Hatanaka (1996), and Gujarati et al. (2017). The summary of the test results is presented in Table 1. Here, at the level, the absolute value of ADF test statistics of all variables is less than the absolute value of a 5% critical level. And also, their p-values are more significant than the 0.05 significance level, which indicates the not rejection of the null hypothesis of an existing unit root.

**Table 1. Unit root test including intercept term**

Source: Calculated using E-views 10, Null Hypothesis: Variable has a unit root. \*Lag length is automatic

| Variable's Name | At Level    |                    |                   |        | At First Difference |                    |                   |        |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|
|                 | Lag Length* | ADF Test statistic | 5% Critical Value | Prob** | Lag length*         | ADF Test statistic | 5% Critical Value | Prob** |
| $\ln CO_2$      | 1           | -0.3706            | -2.935            | 0.9048 | 0                   | -9.626             | -2.935            | 0.0000 |
| $\ln GDP$       | 0           | 2.624450           | -2.933            | 1.0000 | 0                   | -7.590             | -2.935            | 0.0000 |
| $\ln ENG$       | 1           | 2.227156           | -2.935            | 0.9999 | 0                   | -8.334             | -2.935            | 0.0000 |
| $\ln FDI$       | 0           | -2.0550            | -2.933            | 0.2633 | 0                   | -8.119             | -2.935            | 0.0000 |
| $\ln POPG$      | 2           | 0.755960           | -2.9369           | 0.9919 | 1                   | -5.304             | -2.937            | 0.0001 |
| $\ln UR$        | 3           | -4.0837            | -2.9390           | 0.0987 | 2                   | -4.252             | -2.939            | 0.0018 |

based on SIC, max lag=9\*\* Mackinnon (1991) one-sided p values

Again, the absolute value of all variables' ADF test statistics is significantly larger than the absolute value of a 5% critical threshold, and their p-values are less than the 0.05 significance threshold, indicating rejection of the null hypothesis of an existent unit root. Furthermore, all variables had a unit root at the levels (before taking the first differences), but they became stationary after taking the first differences. As a result, all variables are included in order 1 ( $I_1$ ). This suggests that we need to look for cointegration connections between the variables. The cointegration test results (Table 2) show that there is just one cointegrating relation in the equation. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) was used to determine the lag duration, which was lag 3.

**Table 2. Johansen cointegration test: unrestricted cointegration rank test (Trace)**

| Hypothesized No. of C.E. (s) | Eigenvalue | Trace Statistic | 0.05 C.V. | Prob.** |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| None *                       | 0.956291   | 244.2471        | 95.75366  | 0.0000  |
| At most 1 *                  | 0.774195   | 122.1690        | 69.81889  | 0.0000  |
| At most 2 *                  | 0.495297   | 64.13374        | 47.85613  | 0.0007  |
| At most 3 *                  | 0.449858   | 37.46615        | 29.79707  | 0.0054  |
| At most 4                    | 0.198927   | 14.16056        | 15.49471  | 0.0786  |
| At most 5 *                  | 0.131761   | 5.510234        | 3.841466  | 0.0189  |

Source: Calculation by E-views 10, Trace test indicates four cointegration equations at the 0.05 level, and the

Max-eigenvalue test indicates two cointegrating equations at the 0.05 level \*denotes rejection of the null hypothesis of existing cointegration. \*\*Mackinnon (1991) p-values Lag Intervals at the first difference: 1-3.

### 5.1 Estimation of applying the VECM

After establishing a single cointegration connection among the variables, a VECM was calculated for the 1972–2014 sample period using rank  $r = 1$  and three lagged differences. The Akaike Information Criterion was used to calculate all lag durations by minimizing the information criterion (AIC). Table 3 shows the estimated long-run cointegration relationship.

**Table 3. Estimated long-run cointegration vector**

| $\ln CO_{2,t-1}$ | $\ln GDP_{t-1}$ | $\ln ENG_{t-1}$ | $\ln FDI_{t-1}$ | $\ln POPG_{t-1}$ | $\ln UR_{t-1}$ | C        |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|----------|
| 1.000000         | -1.3261         | -1.1246         | 0.0439          | -1.0449          | 0.12601        | 40.45973 |
|                  | (0.16272)       | (0.33236)       | (0.00602)       | (0.10290)        | (0.17651)      |          |
|                  | {-8.1490}       | {-3.3838}       | {7.2885}        | {-10.154}        | {0.71397}      |          |
|                  | [2.787]         | [2.787]         | [2.787]         | [2.787]          | [2.787]        |          |

Source: Calculation by E-views 10

Coefficients indicate significance at the 1% level. Figures in ( ) show standard errors, { } show the t-statistics and [ ] show the critical values at 1% level of significance. The null hypothesis of the zero coefficient will be

rejected if the condition of  $t_{calculated} > t_{critical}$  is fulfilled.

From Table 3, our long-run regression equation is:

$$\ln CO_{2,t-1} = -40.46 + 1.33\ln GDP_{t-1} + 1.12ENG_{t-1} - 0.04FDI_{t-1} + 1.04POPG_{t-1} - 0.13 \ln UR_{t-1}$$

(5)

As observed in Table 3, the coefficient of the first variable is normalized to unity. Estimates of the error correction model in the above equation show that gross domestic product is significant in increasing CO<sub>2</sub> emission. Energy consumption rises CO<sub>2</sub> emission, foreign direct investment decreases CO<sub>2</sub> emission, but population growth increases CO<sub>2</sub> emission. Here the urban population is insignificant; that is why we gave up this variable from our model. Where in a frictional condition, GDP, ENG, POPG leads to an environmental hazard. Their significance is not negligible at about 1.33%, 1.12%, and 1.04%, respectively, increasing CO<sub>2</sub> emission.

This means that any deviation from the long-run equilibrium does not affect reversing the equilibrium connection for these two variables. As a result, the single open variable in the equation can react to bring the system back into equilibrium. Table 4 shows the estimations for the loading matrix.

**Table 4. Speed of adjustment coefficients (1972–2014)**

|            | Coefficient | Standard. Error | t-statistic | Prob.  |
|------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|
| C (1) *    | -1.296696   | 0.291393        | -4.449996   | 0.0003 |
| C (2)      | 0.144129    | 0.229907        | 0.626903    | 0.5382 |
| C (3)      | -0.045225   | 0.217432        | -0.207998   | 0.8374 |
| C (4)      | 0.034776    | 0.173138        | 0.200859    | 0.8429 |
| C (5)      | -0.112675   | 1.506353        | -0.074800   | 0.9412 |
| C (6)      | 0.401889    | 1.339224        | 0.300091    | 0.7674 |
| C (7)      | 0.371946    | 1.155913        | 0.321776    | 0.7511 |
| C (8)      | 0.178566    | 1.094970        | 0.163079    | 0.8722 |
| C (9)      | -1.095745   | 1.050187        | -1.043381   | 0.3099 |
| C (10)     | 0.043505    | 0.923711        | 0.047098    | 0.9629 |
| C (11) *** | 0.043808    | 0.025320        | 1.730196    | 0.0998 |
| C (12) *** | 0.039529    | 0.020249        | 1.952155    | 0.0658 |
| C (13)     | 0.031673    | 0.020777        | 1.524453    | 0.1439 |
| C (14)     | -1.083574   | 1.777570        | -0.609581   | 0.5494 |
| C (15)     | 3.765066    | 2.607850        | 1.443743    | 0.1651 |
| C (16) **  | -3.010729   | 1.367323        | -2.201914   | 0.0402 |
| C (17) *   | 1.881220    | 0.545496        | 3.448644    | 0.0027 |
| C (18)     | 0.915037    | 0.547681        | 1.670748    | 0.1112 |
| C (19) *   | 1.758240    | 0.669785        | 2.625082    | 0.0167 |
| C (20)     | -0.146048   | 0.116911        | -1.249231   | 0.2268 |

Source: Calculation by E-views 10, the test statistics are significant if p values are less than 0.01 (\*) or less than 0.05 (\*\*) or less than 0.10 (\*\*\*)

Where, C (1) is the error correction term, which is both negative and vital in this case. The negative value

indicates that the short-term shock is restoring equilibrium at a rate of 129.67 percent. It also means that returning to the equilibrium level will take less than a year.

### 5.2 Analysis of Diagnostic tests

Here, we have conducted three residual diagnostics such as normality assumption, serial correlation, and Heteroskedasticity Test for the adequacy of the model. The Jarque-Bera test for residual normality assumes that the test statistics cannot be rejected since the P-value is substantially larger than 0.10. In this case, the Null Hypothesis says that the residuals are normally distributed. As a result, residuals in our model are normally distributed. The chi-square test statistics show a higher significant p-value than 0.05 levels in the Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM test. As a result, the null hypothesis that no serial correlation exists cannot be discarded. It implies that in our model, there is no serial correlation. Here, lag is three taken as the AIC criteria. Finally, in Heteroskedasticity Test by ARCH, the chi-square test statistics have a more significant p-value than 0.05 levels. That means the null hypothesis that there is no Heteroskedasticity cannot be rejected. All the test results are given in Table 5. So, from Table 5 results, our model is adequate and specified.

**Table 5. Tests for model adequacy**

| Theory                            | Name of the Test                                   | Null Hypothesis H0                 | Test Statistic | Prob. | Decisions   |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---|
| Normality Assumption of Residuals | Jarque-Bera test                                   | Residuals are normally distributed | 0.0529         | 0.768 | H <sub>0</sub> cannot be rejected at 1%, 5% and 10% level of significance |
| Serial Correlation                | Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM test (lag 3) | There is no serial correlation     | 1.3010         | 0.087 | H <sub>0</sub> cannot be rejected at 1%, 5% level of significance         |
| Heteroskedasticity                | ARCH test (lag 3)                                  | There is no Heteroskedasticity     | 1.6292         | 0.19  | H <sub>0</sub> cannot be rejected at 1%, 5% and 10% level of significance |

Source: Calculated by E-views 10

### 5.3 Findings and Recommendations

The findings show that InFDI has a statistically significant negative impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Economic growth, on the other hand, has a statistically significant and beneficial influence on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions over time. Thus, in the long term, lnENG reduces CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in a positive and statistically meaningful way. To put it another way, rising GDP and more energy use result in higher levels of air pollution in Bangladesh. Furthermore, Population growth is the source of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Global warming, climate change, and environmental concerns are becoming more prevalent in the South Asian area. And this mainly includes sea-level rise, deforestation, soil erosion, desertification, droughts, storms, cyclones, floods, glacier melt and subsequent glacial lake outburst floods, and urban pollution. Moreover, as we can see with increasing GDP, our carbon dioxide emissions are rising, so the government should import environmentally friendly machinery that means technological progress, which will reduce carbon dioxide emissions (Lee et al. 2013).

## 6. Conclusion

For the period 1972–2014, the interaction between carbon emissions, economic growth, energy consumption, population growth, urban population, and foreign direct investment in Bangladesh is explored. The Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) mechanism confirms the long-run equilibrium relationship between the variables examined. According to the error correction term due to the contribution of independent variables in the model, the low levels of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions converge to their long-run equilibrium level at a 129.67 percent speed of adjustment per year. Economic development, energy consumption, population expansion, and foreign direct investment are all long-term predictors of air pollution in Bangladesh, according to this finding.

### Disclosure statement

There were no possible conflicts of interest revealed by the authors.

### References

- Acharyya, J. (2009). Fdi, Growth and the Environment: Evidence from India on CO<sub>2</sub> Emission during the Last Two Decades. *Journal of Economic Development*, 34(1), 43-58. doi:10.35866/caujed.2009.34.1.003
- Akhmat, G., Zaman, K., Shukui, T., Irfan, D., & Khan, M. M. (2014). Does energy consumption contribute to environmental pollutants? evidence from SAARC countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 21(9), 5940-5951. doi:10.1007/s11356-014-2528-1
- Alam, M. M., Murad, M. W., Noman, A. H. M., & Ozturk, I. (2016). Relationships among carbon emissions,

- economic growth, energy consumption and population growth: Testing Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis for Brazil, China, India and Indonesia. *Ecological Indicators*, 70, 466-479.
- Azam, M. (2016). Does environmental degradation shackle economic growth? A panel data investigation on 11 Asian countries. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 65, 175–182. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2016.06.087
- Batten, J. A., & Vo, X. V. (2009). An analysis of the relationship between foreign direct investment and economic growth. *Applied Economics*, 41(13), 1621-1641. doi:10.1080/00036840701493758
- Begum, R. A., Sohag, K., Abdullah, S. M., & Jaafar, M. (2015). CO2 emissions, energy consumption, economic and population growth in Malaysia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 41, 594-601. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.205
- Dickey, D. A., & Fuller, W. A. (1979). Distribution of the Estimators for Autoregressive Time Series with a Unit Root. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(366), 427. doi:10.2307/2286348
- Dogan, E., & Turkekul, B. (2015). CO2 emissions, real output, energy consumption, trade, urbanization and financial development: Testing the EKC hypothesis for the USA. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23(2), 1203-1213. doi:10.1007/s11356-015-5323-8
- Dritsakis, N., & Stamatiou, P. (2019). Causality among CO2 Emissions, Energy Consumption and Economic Growth in Italy. *International Journal of Computational Economics and Econometrics*, 9(4), 1. doi:10.1504/ijcee.2019.10018866
- Edenhofer, O., & Seyboth, K. (2013). Intergovernmental panel on climate change (IPCC).
- Elliott, G., Rothenberg, T. J., & Stock, J. H. (1992). *Efficient tests for an autoregressive unit root*. Cambridge: NBER.
- Engle, R. F., & Granger, C. W. (1991). *Long-run economic relationships: Readings in cointegration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fernandes, A. M., & Paunov, C. (2012). Foreign direct investment in services and manufacturing productivity: Evidence for Chile. *Journal of Development Economics*, 97(2), 305-321. doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2011.02.004
- Gökmenoğlu, K., & Taspınar, N. (2015). The relationship between Co2emissions, energy consumption, economic growth and FDI: The case of Turkey. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 25(5), 706-723. doi:10.1080/09638199.2015.1119876
- Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2017). *Time series econometrics: some basic concepts. Fifth Edition. Basic econometrics*. USA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Harbaugh, W., Levinson, A., & Wilson, D. (2000). Reexamining the Empirical Evidence for an Environmental Kuznets Curve. doi:10.3386/w7711
- Hasanuzzaman, M., Hossain, M. A., da Silva, J. A. T., & Fujita, M. (2012). Plant response and tolerance to abiotic oxidative stress: antioxidant defense is a key factor. In *Crop stress and its management: Perspectives and strategies* (pp. 261-315). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Hatanaka, M. (1996). Unit - Root Asymptotic Theories (II). *Time-Series-Based Econometrics*, 51-62. doi:10.1093/0198773536.003.0006
- Hayakawa, K., Lee, H. H., & Park, D. (2013). The role of home and host country characteristics in FDI: Firm-level evidence from Japan, Korea and Taiwan. *Global Economic Review*, 42(2), 99-112.
- Hermes, N., & Lensink, R. (2003). Foreign direct investment, financial development and economic growth. *Journal of Development Studies*, 40(1), 142-163. doi:10.1080/00220380412331293707
- Jensen, J. (1996). Chlorophenols in the terrestrial environment. In *Reviews of environmental contamination and toxicology* (pp. 25-51). Springer, New York, NY.
- Khobai & Roux (2017). The relationship between energy consumption, trade, GDP (economic growth), population growth and carbon emissions: a recent evidence from South Africa. *International Journal of Sustainable Economy*, 10(2), 99. doi: 10.1504/ijse.2018.10009728
- Lau, L., Choong, C., & Eng, Y. (2014). Investigation of the environmental Kuznets curve for carbon emissions in Malaysia: Do foreign direct investment and trade matter? *Energy Policy*, 68, 490-497. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2014.01.002
- Lee, J.W. The contribution of foreign direct investment to clean energy use, carbon emissions and economic growth. *Energy Policy* 2013, 55, 483–489.
- Mallampally, P., & Sauvart, K. P. (1999). Foreign direct investment in developing countries. *Finance and Development*, 36, 34-37.
- Mudakkar, S. R., Zaman, K., Shakir, H., Arif, M., Naseem, I., & Naz, L. (2013). Determinants of energy consumption function in SAARC countries: Balancing the odds. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 28, 566-574. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2013.08.006
- Mutafoglu, T. H. (2012). Foreign Direct Investment, Pollution, and Economic Growth. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 28(3), 281-297. doi:10.1177/0169796x12453780
- Nelson, C. R., & Plosser, C. R. (1982). Trends and random walks in macroeconomic time series. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 10(2), 139-162. doi:10.1016/0304-3932(82)90012-5

- Ozturk, I., & Acaravci, A. (2010). CO2 emissions, energy consumption and economic growth in Turkey. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 14(9), 3220-3225. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2010.07.005
- Ozturk, I., & Acaravci, A. (2013). The long-run and causal analysis of energy, growth, openness and financial development on carbon emissions in Turkey. *Energy Economics*, 36, 262-267. doi: 10.1016/j.eneco.2012.08.025
- Ozturk, I., & Al-Mulali, U. (2015). Investigating the validity of the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis in Cambodia. *Ecological Indicators*, 57, 324-330. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.05.018
- Rahman, M. M., & Kashem, M. A. (2017). Carbon emissions, energy consumption and industrial growth in Bangladesh: Empirical evidence from ARDL cointegration and Granger causality analysis. *Energy Policy*, 110, 600-608. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2017.09.006
- Reiter, S., & Steensma, H. K. (2010). Human Development and Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries: The Influence of FDI Policy and Corruption. *World Development*, 38(12), 1678-1691. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2010.04.005
- Sauvant, K. P., & Mallampally, P. (2015). Policy Options for Promoting Foreign Direct Investment in the Least Developed Countries. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 7(3), 237-268. doi:10.5148/tncr.2015.7301
- Schmalensee, R., Stoker, T. M., & Judson, R. A. (1995). World energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions: 1950-2050.
- Schmalensee, R., Stoker, T. M., & Judson, R. A. (1998). World Carbon Dioxide Emissions: 1950–2050. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 80(1), 15-27. doi:10.1162/003465398557294
- Shahbaz, M., Jam, F. A., Bibi, S., & Loganathan, N. (2015). Multivariate Granger Causality Between Co2 Emissions, Energy Intensity and Economic Growth in Portugal: Evidence from Cointegration And Causality Analysis. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 22(1), 47-74. doi:10.3846/20294913.2014.989932
- Shahbaz, M., Uddin, G. S., Rehman, I. U., & Imran, K. (2014). Industrialization, electricity consumption and CO2 emissions in Bangladesh. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 31, 575-586. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2013.12.028
- Stretesky, P. B., & Lynch, M. J. (2009). A cross-national study of the association between per capita carbon dioxide emissions and exports to the United States. *Social Science Research*, 38(1), 239-250. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2008.08.004
- Zivot, E., & Andrews, D. W. (1992). Further Evidence on the Great Crash, the Oil-Price Shock, and the Unit-Root Hypothesis. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 10(3), 251. doi:10.2307/1391541