

Review Article

Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth in Botswana. A Dynamic Causality Test.

ABSTRACT

Aims: The study examines the relationship between Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and economic growth using yearly time series data for the period 1980 to 2012.

Study design: Multi-model econometric study.

Place and Duration of Study: Botswana, January 1980 to December 2012.

Methodology: The study uses Augmented Dickey-Fuller and the Phillips-Perron test to test the stationarity of the variables. Johansen and Juselius cointegration test was used to test for cointegration. Finally, the study uses the Granger causality test to determine whether FDI influences economic growth.

Conclusion: Using Johansen cointegration test applied on a dynamic model, we found out that there is a long-term term relationship between FDI and economic growth in Botswana. However, using the Granger causality tests, we were not able to confirm whether it is the FDI that is spurring economic growth or it is economic growth that is promoting FDI inflows.

Keywords: Foreign direct investment; Economic growth; Granger causality; Botswana.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is widespread consensus among many economists that FDI is an important driver of economic growth (for example, Hak (2011) and Sghaier and Abida (2013)). As a result, countries in need of speedy economic development are generally encouraged to create conditions that attract foreign direct investment. The rationale for increased efforts to attract more FDI stems from the belief that FDI has several positive effects which include productivity gains, technology transfers, the introduction of new processes, managerial skills, and know-how in the domestic market, employee training, international production networks, and access to markets (Alfaro et al,2003). In the developing world, FDI is actually seen as a necessity that does not only stimulate economic growth, but help to eradicate poverty. In other words, FDI is seen as panacea to the economic and social problems bedeviling the developing world. Thus, attraction of FDI has become a key economic policy in most developing countries.

For most countries in the developing world, attraction of FDI is actually the centre of their overall economic policies (Adewumi, (2006)). In fact, attraction of FDI has been one of the core objectives of structural adjustment programmes witnessed in most developing countries. Botswana, being a developing country, is one country that has made attraction of FDI a priority, in its endeavor to achieve economic prosperity. Over the last decade, Botswana FDI inflows have averaged about US\$380 million, reaching a high of just US 1 billion in 2011. Much investment inflows go towards the mining sector. For example, out of the P18.144m that was received in 2011, P13.744 million went into the mining sector(see

38 Table 1).Over the same period, the country have consistently registered positive economic
39 growth rate which averaged about 5% . The country's economic performance may be
40 attributed to the FDI inflows. Thus, Botswana may be a perfect example of the positive effect
41 of FDI on economic growth.

42

43 **Table 1a: Foreign Direct Investment in Botswana, 2011**

44

<i>Industry</i>	<i>FDI(Pula - Million)</i>
Mining	13 744
Manufacturing	199
Finance	3 228
Retail and wholesale	417
Electricity gas and water	65
Real estate and business services	2
Transport, storage and communication	193
Construction	65
Hospitality	140
Public administration	0
Other	359
Total	18 414

45

Source: Bank of Botswana Report (2012)

46

47 Whilst the FDI inflows might be having an impact on economic growth, for policy purposes
48 is important to understand the impact with certainty. Furthermore, numerous researches
49 have actually found the impact of FDI on economic growth to be insignificant in some
50 instances (for example Adewumi, 2006 and Geijer, 2008) and also to be significant only
51 under particular environments (for example Alfaro, 2003 and Ozturk, 2007). Thus, attributing
52 economic growth being experienced in Botswana to FDI inflows without an empirical
53 investigation might be incorrect.

54

55 In this paper, we investigate the relationship between FDI inflows and economic growth in
56 Botswana. Our aim is to find out, with some degree of certainty, the causal relationship
57 between FDI and economic growth in Botswana. The rest of the paper is structured as
58 follows: Section 2 reviews literature related to the impact of FDI on economic growth,
59 Section 3 discusses the data and methodology, Section 4 presents the results and Section 5
60 concludes the paper.

61

62 **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

63

64 FDI is broadly defined as capital flows resulting from the behavior of multinational companies
65 (Agiomirgianakis et al, 2004). It is an amount invested by resident of a country in a foreign
66 enterprise over which they have effective control (Ragazzi, 1973 cited by Azam, 2010).
67 Contrary to other capital flows, FDI is less volatile and does not show a pro-cyclical
68 behaviour and has therefore become the "favorite capital inflows" for developing countries
69 (Ozturk, 2007). FDI is now considered as one of the strongest pillars for the economy and
70 everything is done at the level of procedures, regulations and various obligations to attract
71 them (Assen and Anis, 2011).

72

There is overwhelming evidence of consensus among academia and practitioners that FDI tends to have significant effect on economic growth. For example, Hassen and Anis, (2011) used time series techniques to analyse the relationship between FDI and economic growth in Tunisia over the period 1975-2009. Their empirical results suggest that FDI could help boost the process of long-term economic growth.

Hak (2011) conducted a panel data regression analysis on data collected from a sample of 89 countries, to analyse the impact of trade openness and FDI on economic growth. The study concludes that FDI has a significant impact on economic growth.

Sghaier and Abida (2013) examined the causal linkage between FDI, financial development, and economic growth in a panel of 4 countries of North Africa (Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria and Egypt) over the period 1980-2011. Using Generalized Method of Moment (GMM) panel data analysis, they found strong evidence of a positive relationship between FDI and economic growth.

Bengoa and Sanchez-Robles (2003) examined the interplay between economic freedom, FDI and economic growth using a panel data analysis for a sample of 18 Latin American countries for the period 1970-1999. The study reveals a positive relationship between FDI and economic growth.

With increasing evidence of support for strong relationship between FDI and economic growth, a greater amount of literature has also focused on the channels through which FDI may have a positive impact on economic growth. Literature suggest three main channels through which FDI impact economic growth. These are capital formation, technological transfer and human capital. (1) FDI is a source of capital that augments domestic saving the process of capital formation, thereby increasing the capital stock of the country and ultimately leading to economic growth; (2) FDI eases the transfer of technology thereby leading to an increase in factor productivity and efficiency in the utilization of resources, which ultimately leads to economic growth and (3) FDI enhances human capital (skills and knowledge) thereby increasing and improving the existing stock of knowledge in the recipient economy through labor training, skill acquisition and diffusion, leading to more efficient organization of the production process, which ultimately translate into economic growth (Ozturk, 2007; Azam, 2010 and Wan, 2010).

Though there is overwhelming evidence of a significant relationship between FDI and economic growth, evidence of insignificant relationship between FDI and economic growth has also appeared in literature. For example, Adewumi, (2006) examined the contribution of FDI to economic growth in Africa using graphical and regression analysis. He used data for eleven countries within the continent for the empirical analysis for the period 1970-2003. He found out that the contribution of FDI to growth is positive in most of the countries but not significant.

Geijer (2008) used a multiple regression model with GDP as per capita dependent variable to examine whether FDI has any impact on economic growth in Mexico. Though FDI produces positive spillover effects mainly through knowledge and technology spillovers on the domestic economy, the study did not find FDI to have any significant impact on economic growth.

The insignificant relationship between FDI and economic growth noted in literature might be because of the specific empirical approaches and the different time periods used by different researchers (Busse and Groizard, 2008). However, much of the literature seems to attribute this to the specific conditions of the country receiving the FDI. In fact, literature seems to

emphasize that FDI only has a significant positive impact on economic growth under particular environments. Bengoa and Sanchez-Robles, (2003), pointed out that host countries would require adequate human capital, economic stability and liberalized markets to benefit from the resultant long-term capital flows. Ozturk, (2007) pointed out there is a positive association between FDI inflows and growth provided receiving countries have reached a minimum level of educational, technological and/or infrastructure development. Alfaro, (2003) pointed out that FDI brings more positive effect and spillover if host countries minimum threshold level of human capital, and country is more export orientated, and if FDI is focused on more technology intensive sectors. Fortanier (2007) used a panel data analysis of 71 host countries by for the period 1989-2002. The study results confirmed that the growth consequences of FDI vary depending on the host country characteristics. Carkovic and Levine (2002) used a Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) estimator to extract consistent and efficient estimates of the impact of FDI inflows on economic growth. They found out that FDI do not exert an independent influence on economic growth, thereby implying that the impact of FDI on economic is influenced by other growth determinants.

With literature emphasizing the importance of country specific conditions in influencing economic growth, a vast amount of empirical studies focus on the impact of country specific conditions on the FDI-economic relationship. For example, Busse and Groizard, (2008) analyzed the impact of the regulatory environment on the relationship between FDI and economic growth. Their results indicates that more regulated economies are less able to take advantage of the presence of multinational companies, implying that the more regulated a country is, the lower its capability to make use of FDI to spur economic growth.

Toulaboe et al (2009) used an endogenous model to examine the impact of level of economic development on the beneficial effects of FDI. Their study reveals that the impact of FDI on economic growth is greater among technological leaders, thereby implying that absorptive capacity in the host country is important in allowing FDI to positively and fully impact economic growth.

Freckleton et al (2010) examined the impact of corruption on the FDI-economic growth relationship. They studied forty two developing countries using Panel Dynamic Ordinary Least Squares. Their results suggested that corruption has a significant influence on per capita GDP in the short-run, thereby implying that lower levels of corruption enhance the impact of FDI on economic growth.

Based on some empirical findings, it is evident that the impact of FDI on economic growth is therefore not sure and straightforward. It depends on the country conditions under which FDI is provided. It is incorrect to assume that merely increasing FDI inflows will result in greater economic growth. It is imperative for any country to analyze the true impact of FDI on its economy.

3. EMPIRICAL MODEL SPECIFICATION AND ESTIMATION TECHNIQUES

3.1 Theoretical Model

We identified a two variable model which hypothesize Economic Growth (RGDP - Y) as a function of FDI (FDG - X)

$$RGDPG_t = F(FDG_t) \quad (1)$$

The model is specified as follows:

$$Y_t = \alpha + \beta X_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

3.2 Estimation Techniques

Using the above model we followed the following steps, to determine the true impact of FDI on economic growth in Botswana.

Stationarity Test

Firstly, we performed a stationarity test of the model. Stationarity of a series is an important phenomenon because it can influence its behaviour. If x and y series are non-stationary random processes (integrated), then modelling the x and y relationship as a simple Ordinary least Squares (OLS) relationship as in equation 2 will only generate spurious regression.

Time series stationarity is the statistical characteristic of a series such as its mean and variance over time. If both are constant over time, then the series is said to be a stationary process (i.e. is not a random walk/has no unit root), otherwise, the series is described as being a non-stationary process (i.e. a random walk/has unit root). Differencing a series using differencing operation produces other sets of observations such as the first-differenced values, the second- differenced values and so on.

x level	X_t	
x 1 st differenced value	$X_t - X_{t-1}$	
x 2 nd differenced value	$X_t - X_{t-2}$	(3)

If a series is stationary without any differencing, it is designated as $I(0)$, or is of order zero (0). On the other hand, a series that has stationary first differences is designated $I(1)$, or integrated of order one (1). Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) suggested by Dickey and Fuller (1979) and the Phillips-Perron (PP) test recommended by Phillips and Perron (1988) have been used to test the stationarity of the variables.

Johansen and Juselius Cointegration Test

Secondly, we performed a cointegration test to determine whether there is long-term relationship between FDI and economic growth as measured by GDP. We specifically used Johansen and Juselius cointegration tests. Johansen and Juselius (1990) procedures uses two tests to determine the number of cointegration vectors: the Maximum Eigenvalue test and the Trace test. The Maximum Eigenvalue statistic tests the null hypothesis of r cointegrating relations against the alternative of $r-1$ cointegrating relations for $r = 0, 1, 2 \dots n-1$. This test statistics are computed as:

$$LR_{\max}(r/n+1) = -T * \log(1 - \lambda) \quad (4)$$

Where λ is the Maximum Eigenvalue and T is the sample size. Trace statistics investigate the null hypothesis of r cointegrating relations against the alternative n cointegrating relations, where n is the number of variables in the system for $r = 0, 1, 2 \dots n-1$. Its equation is computed according to the following formula:

$$LR_{tr} = -T * \sum_{i=r+1}^n \log(1 - \lambda) \quad (5)$$

In some cases Trace and Maximum Eigenvalue statistics may yield different results and Alexander (2001) indicates that in this case the results of Trace Test should be preferred.

Granger-Causality

Finally we performed the Granger causality test to determine the whether FDI influences economic growth. A general specification of the Granger causality test in a bivariate (X,Y) context can be expressed as:

$$Y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_{t-1} + \dots + \alpha_i Y_{t-i} + \beta_1 X_{t-1} + \dots + \beta_i X_{t-i} + \mu \quad (6)$$

$$X_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_{t-1} + \dots + \alpha_i X_{t-i} + \beta_1 Y_{t-1} + \dots + \beta_i Y_{t-i} + \mu \quad (7)$$

In the model, the subscripts denote time periods and μ is a white noise error. The constant parameter "O" represents the constant growth rate of Y in the equation (6) and X in the equation (7) and thus the trend in these variables can be interpreted as general movements of cointegration between X and Y that follows the unit root process. We can obtain two tests from this analysis: the first examines the null hypothesis that the X does not Granger-cause Y and the second test examines the null hypothesis that the Y does not Granger-cause X. If we fail to reject the former null hypothesis and reject the latter, then we conclude that X changes are Granger- caused by a change in Y (Gul and Ekinc, 2006). Unidirectional causality will occur between two variables if either null hypothesis of equation (7) or (8) is rejected. Bidirectional causality exists if both null hypothesis are rejected and no causality exists if neither null hypothesis of equation (7) nor (8) is rejected (Duasa, 2007).

3.3 Data

We used the data of FDI and GDP spanning from 1980 to 2012. The data was collected from the World Bank, World Development Indicators

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Stationarity

The null hypothesis of no unit roots for both the time series are rejected at levels at 1% level of significances since the ADF and PP test statistics values are less than the critical values at 1 % level of significances, Table 1

Table 1b: ADF and PP unit root test

Series	ADF		PP	
	Level		Level	
RGDPG p- value	-3.702 (0.0001)		-3.702 (0.0001)	
FDG p-value	-3.702 (0.0000)		3.702 (0.0000)	

RGDPG and FDG are both I(0) . That is, there is no need for differencing. Both variables are stationary in levels.

4.2 Co-Integration Test

275 Cointegration rank is estimated using Johansen methodology. Johansen's approach derives
 276 two likelihood estimators for the Cointegration (CI) rank; a trace test and maximum Eigen
 277 value test, Table 2.

278

279 **Table 2: Results of cointegration tests**

280

Johansen tests for cointegration					
Trend: constant			Number of obs =		26
Sample: 1987 - 2012			Lags =		7
maximum rank	parms	LL	eigenvalue	trace statistic	5% critical value
0	26	-322.83723		19.6166	15.41
1	29	-313.69794	0.50491	1.3380*	3.76
2	30	-313.02894	0.05016		

281

282 The trace statistic either rejects the null hypothesis of no co-integration among the variables
 283 or does not reject the null hypothesis that there is one co-integration relation between the
 284 variables. We start by testing $H_0: r = 0$. If it rejects, we repeat for $H_0: r = 1$. When a test is not
 285 rejected, stop testing there and that value of r is the commonly used estimate of the number
 286 of co-integration relations. From Table 2; $H_0: r = 1$ is not rejected at the 5% level
 287 (1.3380<3.76). In other words, this trace test result does not reject the null hypothesis that
 288 these two variables are not cointegrated. Since the rank is equal to one which is greater
 289 than zero and less than the variables, the series are cointegrating among the variables. That
 290 is, there is long term relationship between FDI and economic growth in Botswana.

291

292 4.3 Granger Causality Tests

293

294 The study employs the error-correction-based causality test, since it captures both the short
 295 run and long run dynamics. Having confirmed the existence of the long-run relationships
 296 between FDI and real GDP per capita, the next step is to examine the Granger-causality
 297 between the two variables. The direction of the Granger-causality in this case can be tested
 298 by using the following model (Odhiambo, 2010; Narayan and Smyth, 2008).

299

$$300 \Delta \ln \text{RGDPG} / N_t = \phi_0 + \sum \phi_{1i} \Delta \ln \text{RGDPG} / N_{t-i} + \sum \phi_{2i} \Delta \ln \text{FDI}_{t-i} + \text{ECM}_{t-1} + \mu_t \quad (8)$$

301

302

303

$$304 \Delta \ln \text{FDI}_t = \delta_0 + \sum \delta_{1i} \Delta \ln \text{FDI}_{t-i} + \sum \delta_{2i} \Delta \ln \text{RGDPG} / N_{t-i} + \text{ECM}_{t-1} + \mu_t \quad (9)$$

305

306 where ECM_{t-1} = the lagged error-correction term obtained from the long-run equilibrium
 307 relationship.

308

309 Table 4 provides the results of the pair wise analysis. Significant probability values denote
 310 rejection of the null hypothesis.

311

312 **Table 4: Granger Causality Test**

313

Null Hypothesis	χ^2	Probability	Decision
FDIG does not Granger-cause RGDPG	2.77528	0.4276	Do not reject
RGDPG does not Granger-cause FDIG	1.028712	0.7943	Do not reject

314

From table 4, since neither of the null hypotheses is rejected, there is no Granger -causality in either direction between FDI and economic growth in Botswana. Thus, our results cannot confirm that FDI is influencing economic growth.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The paper investigated the relationship between FDI and economic growth in Botswana. Using Johansen cointegration test applied on a dynamic model, we found out that there is a long-term term relationship between FDI and economic growth in Botswana. However, using the Granger causality tests, we were not able to confirm whether it is the FDI that is spurring economic growth or it is economic growth that is promoting FDI inflows. Nevertheless, the fact that there is a significant relationship between economic growth and FDI imply that both affect each other in one way or another. Botswana should therefore continue to create conditions that attract FDI in order to influence economic growth. At the same time Botswana should continue to improve the economy so as to attract FDI which will in turn help to further grow the economy.

REFERENCES

- Adewumi S, Hacker S, Dzansi J (2006):The Impact of FDI on Growth in Developing Countries, An African Experience: **Jonkoping International Business School pp1-18**
- Agiomirgianakis, G; Asteriou , D and Papathoma, K(2004):The Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment: A Panel Data Study for the OECD Countries: **Discussion Paper Series No. 03/06**
- Aizhan, K., Makaevna, M. D. (2011), Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on Economic Growth in Kazakhstan, **2011 International Conference on Sociality and Economics Development, IPEDR**. Vol (10) pp 414-419
- Alfaro. L; Chanda, A; Kalemli-Ozcan, S and Sayek, S (2003): FDI and Economic Growth: The Role of Local Financial Markets: **Journal of International Economics**. Vol 64(1) pp 89-112
- Awe, A. A (2013): The Impact of Foreign Direct Investment On Economic Growth In Nigeria: **Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development**. Vol.4, No.2 pp122-132
- Azam, M (2010): Economic Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment in Armenia, Kyrgyz Republic and Turkmenistan: Theory and Evidence: **Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics**. Vol 3 (6), 27-40.
- Bank of Botswana (2012): **Annual Report**
- Bengoa, M and Sanchez-Robles, B (2003): Foreign Direct Investment, Economic Freedom and Growth: New Evidence from Latin America: **European Journal of Political Economy**: Vol.19 pp 529–545
- Busse, M and Groizard, J.L (2008): Foreign Direct Investment, Regulations and Growth: **The World Economy, Blackwell Publishing Ltd**. Vol 31(7) pp 861-886

- 368 Contessi, S and Weinberger, A (2009): Foreign Direct Investment, Productivity, and Country
369 Growth: An Overview: **Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review**, Vol 91(2) pp 61-78.
370
- 371 Darrat, A and Sarkar, J (2009): Growth Consequences of Foreign Direct Investment: Some
372 Results For Turkey: **Journal of Economic Development**: 85 Vol 34 No 2 pp 85-96
373
- 374 Fortanier, F (2007): Foreign direct investment and host country economic growth: Does the
375 investor's country of origin play a role? **Transnational Corporation**. Vol 16 (2), pp 41-76
376
- 377
- 378 Geijer, K (2008): Foreign Direct Investment in Mexico: Possible Effects on the Economic
379 Growth: Masters Thesis, Department of Economics, Uppsala University
380
- 381
- 382 Hak, C.W (2011): Do Foreign Direct Investment and Trade Openness Accelerate Economic
383 Growth? **Senior Capstone Project, April 2011**
384
- 385
- 386 Hassen, S and Anis, O (2011): Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and Economic Growth: An
387 approach in terms of cointegration for the case of Tunisia: **Journal of Applied Finance and**
388 **Banking**. Vol 2(4) pp193–207.
389
- 390
- 391 Hermes, N and Lensin, R (2003): Foreign Direct Investment, Financial Development and
392 Economic Growth: **The Journal of Development Studies**. Vol. 40(1) pp142-163
393
- 394
- 395 Kotrajaras, P (2010): Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth: A Comparative
396 Study among East Asian Countries: **Applied Economics Journal**. Vol17 (2) pp 12-26
397
- 398 Krstevska, A and Petrovska, M (2012): The Economic Impacts of the Foreign Direct
399 Investments: Panel Estimation by Sectors on the Case of Macedonian Economy: **Journal of**
400 **Central Banking Theory and Practice** Vol 2 pp. 55-73
401
- 402
- 403 Liu, (2008): Foreign direct investment and technology spillovers: Theory and Evidence:
404 **Journal of Development Economics**. Vol 85: pp176–193
405
- 406 Lo, D (2004): Assessing the Role of Foreign Direct Investment in China's Economic
407 Development: Macro Indicators and Insights from Sectoral-Regional Analyses: University of
408 **London Department of Economics Working Papers** No.135 pp 1-36
409
- 410 Katerina, L; John, P and Athanasios, V (2004): Foreign Direct Investment And Economic
411 Growth In Transition Economies: South; **Eastern Europe Journal of Economics**. Vol 1 pp
412 97-110
413
- 414 Moura, R and Forte, R (2010): The Effects of Foreign Direct Investment on the Host Country
415 Economic Growth - Theory and Empirical Evidence: **FEP Working Papers** 390,
416 Universidade do Porto, Faculdade de Economia do Porto.
417
- 418 Onu, A. J. C (2012) Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on Economic Growth in Nigeria:
419 **Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business**: Vol 4(5) pp 64-79
420

- 421 Ozturk, I (2007): Foreign Direct Investment - Growth Nexus: A Review of the Recent
 422 Literature: **International Journal of Applied Econometrics and Quantitative Studies**. Vol
 423 4 (2) pp79-98
 424
 425
 426 Sghaier, I.M and Abida, Z (2013): Foreign Direct Investment, Financial Development and
 427 Economic Growth: Empirical Evidence from North African Countries: **Journal of**
 428 **International and Global Economic Studies**. Vol 6(1) pp 1-131
 429
 430
 431 Tiwari, A.K and Mutascu, M (2011): Economic Growth and FDI in Asia: A Panel-Data
 432 Approach: **Economic Analysis & Policy**. Vol 41(2) pp173-187
 433
 434
 435 Toulaboe, D; Terry, R and Johansen, T (2009) Foreign Direct investment and Economic
 436 Growth In Developing Countries: **Southwestern Economic Review** pp 155-170
 437
 438 Wan, X (2010): A Literature Review on the Relationship between Foreign Direct Investment
 439 and Economic Growth: **International Business Research**. Vol 3(1) pp 52-56
 440
 441 World Bank. (2012). *World Development Indicators*. Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org>
 442 [Accessed March 21, 2015].
 443
 444 Xing, Y and Pradhananga, M (2013): How Important are Exports and Foreign Direct
 445 Investment for Economic Growth in the People's Republic of China? **ADB Working Paper**
 446 **Series** No 427, Asian Development Bank Institute
 447
 448 Zenasni, S and Benhabib, A (2013): The Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment and
 449 Their Impact on Growth: Panel Data Analysis for AMU Countries: **International Journal of**
 450 **Innovation and Applied Studies**. Vol 2 pp 300-313.
 451