NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

ECONOMICS MASTER'S PROGRAME

MASTER THESIS

EMPIRICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

AN ARDL CO-INTEGRATION APPROACH FOR PAKISTAN

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATION OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

ABDUL MAJID KHAN

NICOSIA
2016

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

ECONOMICS MASTER'S PROGRAME

MASTER THESIS

EMPRICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT AND EOCNOMIC GROWTH

AN ARDL CO-INTEGRATION APPROACH FOR PAKISTAN

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATION OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

ABDUL MAJID KHAN

NICOSIA
2016

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation is the product of my own work, that it has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged as complete references.

Name, Surname: Abdul Majid Khan

Signature: ……

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervising professor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Özdeşer for his time and encouragement through my master study. I could not have accomplished without his guidance. It is with his supervision that this work came into existence. For any faults I take full responsibility.

Furthermore, I also deeply thank my fellow students at NEU, for their generous help and precious friendship.

Finally, I owe great to my family for their support and love. My parents have encouraged me throughout the whole journey of my Master study. My friends have accompanied me through the hardest times and made me always feel optimistic about life and future. Without their unreserved support and love, completion of this work would not have been possible.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my parents. All I have and will accomplish are only possible due to their love and sacrifices.

ABSTRACT

The study examined the empirically relationship between Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and Economic Growth (EG) in Pakistan, from 1975-2013, the study employed Autoregressive Disttrubted Lag Approach (ARDL), the study used Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) and Phillips Perron test (PP) to check the presence of unit root and found out that all the variables are stationary at first differencing except Inflation was stationary at level they are mixture of I(1) and I(0). We also used bound test to check the cointegration of the model equation, which reveal the presence of cointegration long-run relationship between economic growth and other selected macro economic variables (Trade Openness, Total Debt, Inflation, Domestic Saving and Gross Capital Formation). The main aim of the study was to examine the relationship between Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and economic growth, either in long-or short-run effects, also the highlight the relationship status between the variables included in the model and granger causality between FDI and economic growth in Pakistan. On the basis of the empirical results acquired, Policy proposals are advised to attract FDI in Pakistan. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) is essential for economic growth in developing countries. FDI allows transfer the transfer of technology, uplift in the domestic competition in the domestic input market, contributes to human capital development.

Keywords: Foreign Direct Investment, ARDL Approach to cointegration, Economic growth, Granger causality

OZ

Bu çalışma, 1975-2013 yılları arasında Pakistan'daki Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımı ile ekonomi arasındaki ilişkiyi deneysel olarak açıklamaya çalışmıştır. Çalışmada ARDL, ADF ve birim kök için Phillips Perron testi kullanılmıştır. Enflasyon dışında bütün değişkenler 1. Türev sonrasında durağan çıkmıştır. Ayrıca ekonomik büyüme ve diğer değişkenler arasındaki uzun vade ilişkisini ölçmek için bağlı test kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın esas amacı Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımı ile ekonomik büyüme arasındaki ilişkinin uzun vadede veya kısa vadedeki etkisini ortaya çıkarmaktır. Ayrıca değişkenler arasındaki ilişkiyi ve Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımı ile ekonomik büyüme arasındaki nedensellik ilişkisine vurgulanmıştır. Elde edilen deneysel sonuçlar doğrultusunda Pakistan'a Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımını çekmek için politika tasarısı tavsiye edilmiştir. Gelişmekte olan ülkelerde, ekonomk büyüme için Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımı gerekli bir araçtır. Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımı, teknoloji aktarımına, yerel piyasada yerel rekabeti kalkındırmaya ve insan sermayesinin gelişimine katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımı, eşbütünleşme için ARDL yaklaşım, ekonomik büyüme, nedensellik

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIQURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADF	Augmented Dickey Fuller
PP	Phillips Perron
ARDL	Auto Regressive Disttrubted Lag
CPI	Consumer Price Index
ECM	Error Correction Model
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
INF	Inflation
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference for Trade And Development
EG	Economic Growth
OLS	Ordinary Least square
TD	Total Debt
TO	Trade Openness
DS	Domestic Saving
GCF	Gross Capital Formation
RGDPGR	Real Gross Domestic Product Growth Rate
HDI	Human Development Index
SIZs	Special Industrial Zones

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Nowadays; Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) has been important subject in the field of world economics. In an era of volatile flows of international capital, the solidity of FDI and its materialization is a significant source of foreign capital for developing countries, has transformed interest in its relationship with sustainable economic growth (Klein, 2000). Indeed, for developing economies, net inflows of FDI have increased almost five times from an average of 0.44 % of Gross National Product (GNP) in the period of 1970-74 to 2.18 percent of GNP in the period 1993-97. FDI now forms a major component of Domestic Investment (DI) activity in developing economies accounting for more than 8% of Gross Domestic Investment (GDI) in the mid 1990s up from 2% of GDI in the early 1970s. This dramatic development has taken place simultaneously with a substantial growth in international trade. Finally, FDI is now the pre-eminent source of capital flows in the mid- 1990s up from approximately 18% of flows in the 1970-74 period (UNCTAD, 2000, 2004 and 2006). The massive increase in the size of FDI during the last twenty years offers a strong motivation for research on this trend.

The continuous processes of integration of the worldwide economy and liberalization of the economies in various developing countries have led to a ferocious competition. The mind-set towards inward FDI has changed significantly over the preceding couple of decades, as majority of the countries have liberalized their policies to magnetize investments from foreign MNCs. Both developed and developing countries have practiced enlarged inflows of FDI, with some fluctuations over year to year. Developed countries have attracted massive of FDI since mid1970s but on the other hand the developing countries remain unsuccessful in creating enabling atmosphere investors

(sajid, 2004).

According to United Nations conference report in (2002), FDI has strong and significant contribution to economic development which includes: potential technology transfer, formation of new job opportunities, knowledge and enhance competitiveness and private enterprise (Reiter and Steensma, 2010). According to (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD], 2006) FDI have the ability to create employment, amplify productivity, entrepreneurial ability, technology transfer and foreign skills, boost exports and involve in the positive development of the developing countries.

According to UNCTAD (2002), the average annual inflow of FDI increased from an amount $159 billion in 1986-91 to $865 billion in year 1999.As compared to the inflow of FDI, the percentage of Domestic Capital Formation (DCF) in the world grews from 2.3 percent in year 1980 to 11.1 percent in year 1998. Therefore, the contribution of multinational companies (MNCs) in the world's GDP was 25 percent in 1997. Approximately 90 percent in trade technology and three-quarters in research & development (R & DD) are conducted by multinational companies (MNCs) [Dunning (1993)]. It has been argued that economic growth depends on technology transfer and FDI play a key role because it encourages the diffusion of technology. Zhang (2001) has experienced that FDI is just like an engine for the host country's economic growth because (a) it intakes FDI, creates capital formation and jobs opportunities (b) FDI encourages or boost up to promote manufacturing exports (c) FDI bring bulk of resources opportunities to the host country like: man power skills, skilled labor from international markets and management skills e.t.c. (d) FDI may support innovation exchange and overflow impacts.

The inward FDI in developing countries fallowed irregular paths in 1980s and gradually started increasing in the successive period of 1985-2000. This inflow has jumped from $10100 million in year 1986 to 87124 million in the year [UNCTAD (1985-1995)]. The volume of FDI has been varied according to different countries. Specifically, China

received maximum 31 percent of the entire FDI while Brazil received 13 percent and last India and Venezuela received almost close to three (03) percent. Inflow of FDI in Pakistan was approximately 1101.7$ million in year 1995 and it increased up to annual amount 1524$ at the end of the year 2005. Currently it was round about $ 3020.2 million.

Despite of the growing volume of these inflows to developing countries, this resulted in the gap between FDI flows to develop and developing countries have increased in 80s. This was largely due to three factors, firstly the continuing economic complexities faced by several developing countries and these difficulties have made them less. Secondly the increased in importance of technologically intensive instruments favoring locations in further developed countries and thirdly the fear of a rise in protectionist forces in the European Community and in the United States (Markusen and Zhang, 2001, Blonigen and Whang, 2005 and UNCTAD, 2006). Vast majority of literature proposes that FDI is related with economic situation of the host country (Dunning1981; 1988; 1993 and 2001).

From the foreign investors' point of view, FDI is justified by essential differences in production costs due to factor productivity and payment differentials across countries (Caves, 1971, Lall, 1978, Aggarwal, 1980, Batra and Ramachandran, 1980 and Dunning, 1981). Consolidating the market shares overseas also stimulates FDI. From the recipient economic point of view, FDI is attractive and important for a numeral of reasons, varying from growth enhancement via capital accrual.

FDI is also projected to incorporate domestic firms in international production and investment networks, which is likely to increase efficiency and output growth. In addition to this, FDI comprises an excellent source of present account financing and Balance of Payments (BOPs) relief, particularly if it is export-oriented and saving-enhancing. In an international economy, macroeconomic unsteadiness and policy-induced alterations in goods and capital markets tend to minimize the location advantage

of a host country in the competition for inward FDI and capital inflows (Lim, 1983).

In the fast changing global economic landscape, almost every country including developed and developing, large and small alike have required FDI to make their development process easy. FDI is frequently undertaken with the purpose of enjoying control over a venture rather than simply achieving an inert voice in corporate affairs. Thus, the FDI can exercise more deep influence on country's growth; industrial structure; employment and trade patterns than other capital flows (UNCTAD, 2004).

Hence, FDI can affect the intensity of output and trade of a country by serving as an engine of growth and development (Agarwal, 1980 and Meyer 1988). This unparalleled boost in the size of FDI in developing countries has encouraged research on FDI and economic growth linkages, because it has intensely changed the shape and structure of the modern and current global economy (UNCTAD, 1999). Therefore, this study makes several contributions to the literature.

1.2 Problem statement

In last two (02) decades ago, FDI has been key sources of external financing for developing countries like Pakistan. FDI is considered by different economist and international institutions as key player for enhancing economic growth as well as solve the problem of developing countries (Mencinger, 2003). Mostly FDI is defined as an investment involving the transfer human and capital assets, including: financial capital, advanced technology, better managerial practices etc

Empirically enormous of studies have been conducted on FDI through which it concluded that FDI boosted up the economic growth, improve the standard of living. However there is also evidence that FDI have negative effect (Saqib, Masnoon, & Rafique, 2013), While some evidence supported that FDI does not affect the economic growth. Some views are that FDI accelerates economic growth specially Blomström

(1986), Mody and Wang (1997), NairReichert and Weinhold (2001), and Lensink and Morrissey (2006) studies.

It is in line of the above authors‘ambiguity in results that this study intends to explore the empirical effects that FDI may have had on the economic growth of Pakistan.

1.3 Objective of the study

The essential objective of the study is to examine the empirical relationship between FDI and economic growth from of 1975-2013 using Bound Test of cointegration approach and causality test by Granger (1969) method. To achieve this broader objective, study is specially defined to:

- Explore the significant relationship between FDI, TO, TD, INF, DS, GCF and Economic Growth in Pakistan.
- To find the causal linkage between FDI and economic growth in Pakistan.

1.4 Hypothesis of the study

The hypothesis that this study seek to verify are as stated below:

H0a: There is no significant impact of FDI on EG.

H1a: There is significant impact of FDI on EG.

H0b: There is no significant impact of TO on EG.

H1b: There is significant impact of TO on EG.

H0c: There is no significant impact of TD on EG.

H1c: There is significant impact of TD on EG.

H0d: There is no significant impact of INF on EG.

H1d: There is significant impact of INF on EG.

H0e: There is no significant impact of DS on EG.

H1e: There is significant impact of DS on EG.

H0f: There is no significant impact of GCF on EG.

H1f: There is significant impact of GCF on EG.

H0g: FDI does not granger cause EG.

H1g: FDI granger cause EG.

H0h: EG does not granger cause FDI.

H1h: FDI granger cause EG.

1.5 Justification of the Study

As limited studies have been carried out to find the relationship between FDI and economic growth so, this study will prove an effective. Moreover, the study will provide an insight about 'Empirical Relationship' between FDI in economic growth of Pakistan and its macro impact on Pakistan economy. Furthermore, it will help the legal bodies and government authorizes in decision and promoting the stipulation of foreign direct investment for better and productive results. Furthermore, it will help the legal bodies and government authorizes in decision and promoting the stipulation of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) for better and prolific consequences.

1.6 Significance of the study

As an attempt to add to the growing body of empirical studies on the relationship between FDI and economic growth and to answer the question of whether or not the selected variables influence the economic growth in the case of Pakistan, this study will use developed econometric techniques to empirically investigate this question.

1.7 Structure of the study

The study is structured into six chapters. The first chapter is already discussed above Chapter two presents the summary of existing theoretical and empirical literature on

FDI-growth interaction. Chapter three represents an overview of FDI policy in Pakistan. Chapter four consists of data description and methodology of the study. Chapter five focuses on the data analysis model estimations. Chapter six comprises the summary, conclusions and policy recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

EMPIRICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a detailed review of the existing studies in the field of empirical literature. The first section examines the empirical literatures of interest in topics, and the second sections draw literature comments.

2.1 Empirical Literature Review

The literature on economics exhibits that FDI is running the blood for economic growth of a country. The idea of FDI is not new in the literature. In the past various aspects related to impact of FDI have been investigated. However, determinants and empirical relationship of FDI has been investigated on theoretical basis without empirical evidence. With the passage of time econometric models, equations, mathematical and statistical techniques were used to find the impact of FDI on empirical basis. Early studies are totally based on internationally trade, firm and pure economic theory while latest studies, are based on perfect competition, identical production functions and zero production cost (Kindleberger, 1984). Current theories are based on important assumptions of imperfections, oligopolistic interdependence and monopoly advantage. These assumptions will bear the actual impact of FDI on economic growth and determining the FDI inflows.

The literature is mainly dominated by the studies that investigate the statistical relationship between FDI and Economic growth. Well known scholars have conducted that the relationship exist between the two variables whereas; some of them also emphasize on their negative effects. There are some scholars who do not find any relationship between the two variables. In this research the important empirical studies are critically reviewed in order to achieve objective in framework of Pakistan and further analyze it to illustrate various critical conclusion and policy recommendations.

In this section, a selected number of the empirical studies are reviewed. The empirical studies reviewed are classified in to four groups: (i) Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Trade Openness (TO), Total Debt (TD) and economic growth (ii) Inflation (INF) and economic growth (iii) Domestic Saving (DS) and economic growth (iv) Gross Capital Formation (GCF) and economic growth (iv) Literature comments

2.2.1 Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Trade Openness (TO), Total Debt (TD) and economic growth

According to the study of Chenery and Strout (1996), the empirical evidence from LDCs concluded FDI have affirmative bond with economic expansion. Later on, some other reliable studies also argued that FDI encourages the economic growth. In addition to some other economist views, Leff (1969) and Griffin (1970), concluded the impact on economic growth by substituting the household savings therefore; the literature of FDI exhibits both its positive and negative impact on economic growth. It has been argued that foreign aid increases the economic growth rate of a country. The results obtained are not part of a favorable policy of a country. Although, there are some returns to foreign economic assistance while the projected assistance of FDI is strictly responsive to the estimators' choice and to the controlled variables set. By putting restriction on a human capital and investment activities not a single positive effect was observed in FDI. Moreover, foreign aid stimulates the economic growth through investment (Findlay, 1978 and Das, 1987).

MacDoughall (1960), studied the cost and benefit analysis of FDI in different countries. In his theoretical approach the FDIs impact on economic growth depends on easy and simple neoclassical framework. Diamond (1965), viewed that those countries which import capital have brighter future as compared to those which export capital. He also emphasized on productivity of FDI. Otherwise, the countries will not get any actual benefits from it. Therefore, early literature of 1960 reveals that in short run the impact of FDI on economic growth is positive while it is not beneficial and sustainable in long run.

Dramatically the world economy has been changed over the last twenty years. In 1960s and 1970s, majority of the countries were not interested in FDI. Now most of the countries observed FDI as an economic indicator in development of a country. In liberalization age, several studies were conducted to investigate the effects of FDI on economic growth globally and internationally (Bhagwati, 1973).

Bhagwati (1978), investigated the outcome of FDI with special evidence to international trade and economic development. The results concluded that those countries which adopt export led growth strategy could get enormous benefit from FDI. On the other hand, policies of import substitution are applicable when two exchange rates are not identical. Balasubramanyam et.al (1992) analyzed the same hypothesis proposed by Bhagwati. His results are also in support of outward oriented approach because growth rate is higher as compared to import oriented approach**.**

Stoneman (1975), investigated that how FDI influences the economic growth for developing countries. His results concluded that FDI expend the output level for those countries which have higher capital stock and it also increase the Balance of Payment (BOP) status. Furthermore, the countries where capital is less as compared to labor or the labor-capital ratio is small will expect to have additional profits, a larger capital formation and more per capita growth (Solow, 1956).

Furthermore, Sung-Hoon Lim et.al (1998), explains the benefit of FDI and argued that FDI inflows provides wide range of affirmative externalities e.g. consistent foreign capital inflow, create employment opportunities, increase in Gross National Product (GNP), improvement in Balance of Payment (BOP) and transferring technical skills to the host country. These are the main goal of FDI inducing policy. Soboleva (1999) in her studies constructed a dynamic structural model for the firms to study the impact of trade policy on FDI. Briefly these factors are political stability, macro-economic factors and growth strategy factors of the host country.

Ali (1997) Multiple of determinants of FDI are considered in the area of exports for Puerto Rice in the year 1979. The study explains that only low cost of labor is not a key determinant of FDI. The study also argued that size of the firm, depends upon the FDI inflows in the industry. In addition to, Balamstram, Lipsey and Zejan (1994), also recommended that certain threshold of growth is essential for the host country to attain the diffusion of technology through FDI in the case of developing economics. One of the key findings of this study was significant positive impact of FDI on the economic development.

Gonzalez (1988), further explains the study done by Srinivasan (1983) by making analysis of benefit of FDI. He says that FDI increase the social strength of the people if there is no twist. The study supports import substitution policies because such policy creates job opportunities and improves the living standard of the people. But this study doesn't reveal the effects of welfare and FDI pattern of trade in the economy. Finally, both Srinivasan (1983) and Gonzalez (1988) ended up by concluding that FDI increases the social strength of the people if there is no disturbance in the labor market. In addition to, Gonzalez (1988) views that FDI effects national income through rural and urban people. FDI increases the national income and enhances the standard of the living of the people in Harris-Tadoro economy without pattern of the international trade. At last, it has been concluded that greater possibility exists; FDI increases the national income if the absolute elasticity value of rural wage is greater and the traffic is stumpy.

Fry (1993), the finding extracted from macroeconomic analysis explains that unlike the cases of Latin American, FDI is the key factor for increasing the productivity stock. Furthermore, change in investment and domestic saving will tend to expend together with FDI inflows. Hein (1993) and Dollar (1992), conducted the study and found that those economics which depend upon the export markets have successful in gaining more FDI inflows. Malik (1996), examined that, the key reasons behind the debt crises are the capital lack in majority of the developing countries (LDCs). Moreover, FDI boost

growth of the economy but growth does not attract FDI. This argument experiences that those countries which attract more FDI have brighter growth. Trade policy and political instability are considered to be the vital FDI determinant.

Guisinger (1997), studied the impact of FDI liberalization of Pakistan economy. It reviewed significant results obtained from World Bank, NBER, OECD and liberalization of trade which explains positive impact with economic growth. He concluded in his study that Pakistan economy experiences less costs and the economy significantly benefits from consistently inflow of investment liberalization.

Khan (2007), studies the policies and trend of FDI in the framework of Pakistan. He is interested to find the reasons behind why Pakistan is not successful in attracting more FDI inflows despite in trade openness of its economy. The major reasons behind the low level of FDI inflows are political instability of 1990s, unstable law and order situation of Karachi. In addition to, unpleasant business climate, lack of infrastructure and conflicting policies between investors and government are responsible to discourage the investors to endow in Pakistan. Illiterate, unskilled labor and other distortions are also responsible for low economic growth which results in closing the doors for fruitful and productive investment. In addition to that he forced to uplift the investment climate in the country, which characterized by four "Cs"e.g Cost, Convenience, Capability and Concessions. As mentioned by Khan, Pakistan has focusing so far just on one (01) "C" which is Concession and left the remaining other three(03) "Cs". Pakistan government should specially focus to the Cost, Convenience and Capability features in order to get maximum FDI in the country.

Shabbir H.Kazmi (1982), has experiment the waning drift of FDI in Pakistan. In this study he found that Pakistan has progressive track record in term of economic growth in early 60's and still it has potential to recover the same economic growth. Pakistan is facing unbalanced economic growth. Government of Pakistan needs to come out with wide-range of pre-investment policies. However, poor democratic structure and pressure

groups are exploiting the system. Post economic sanctions reveal that in order to boost the economic growth again the government should rehabilitate the economy by magnetize more FDI.

Khan and Rahim (1993), found that FDI accelerates the growth rate of GDP. Aslam (1987), examined that public FCI has not affected the domestic savings where as private FCI covered the investment saving gap. FDI is running the blood for growth of economy and it acts as an engine for economic development. Therefore, Pakistan needs strong conductive environment as compared to other countries in order to magnetize more FDI inflows (Shabbir and Mahmood, 1992).

Nasir S.M et.al (2005), stated in his book named "Economics of Pakistan" that there is a positive relationship between the population and development of economic activities of Pakistan. He also found that higher growth rate of population is the key indicator for economic development.

Arshad (2012), studied the long run relationship between FDI, GDP and trade policy for Pakistan. The data span for the study was from 1965 to 2005. The results indicated that both export and import is statistically significant and it affects GDP in short-run while; FDI has no effect on GDP in the long run.

Falki (2009), scrutinize the shock of FDI on Economic progress of Pakistan. The sample size of the data is from 1980 to 2006 and variables included in the study are labor force, domestic saving and foreign invested capital. Endogenous Growth Theory has been used for the regression analysis, and concluded that FDI has a negative effect on GDP and FDI in the country.

Shabbir and Mahmood (1982), deliberate the association among FDI and economic growth for Pakistan nation. The data for the study is taken as time series annually data for the period of 1950 -1960 to 1987-1988. The estimated results of the studies concluded that FDI (loans and loans) has significant positive impact on the Real GNP. In

addition,(Ahmed, et.al, 2003), was interested to study the relationship between FDI and exports by applying Granger Causality procedure for the period of 1972 to 2001 for Pakistan economy. The results concluded that effect of FDI with respect to domestic output has a significant impact. The result concluded that FDI impact is larger under export promotion regime as compared to import substitution regime.

Aurangzeb et.al (2012), analyzed the relationship between foreign capital inflows and economic growth. He considered four variables in his study which are FDI, GDP, External debt and Remittance. Multiple regression analysis technique is used. Time series secondary was taken from 1981 to 2001. The results showed that three variables e.g FDI, external debt and remittance have statistically positive relationship with economic growth.

Louzi et.al (2001), was interested to study the effect of FDI on Jordanian economy. Sample size for this study is from 1990 to 2009. The result indicates that foreign direct investment has no relationship with Jordan economy but domestic investment and trade liberalization has statistically positive effect on growth rate of GDP.

Zhang (2001), collected data on Latin America and 11 East countries to find the association link between FDI and economic growth. The result concluded that FDI will lead to promote in those countries where they are giving free hand to the international trade.

Panel data approach has been used by Tiwari and Matascu (2001) to find the involvement of inflows of FDI with GDP. Time period taken for this study is from 1986 to 2008. Total 23 countries were included in this study. The analysis concluded that FDI and exports boost up economic growth.

Choe (2003), panel data is used from the period 1975-2013 by using VAR model. The results indicated that there strong relationship exist between FDI and economic growth.

Further the finding is that uni-directionality exists from economic growth to domestic saving (DS). .

Hermes et.al (2003), concluded that strong financial sector plays a key role in the economic growth. Both development and financial sector is the pre-condition to boost the economic development positively. The study was undertaken over 67 countries in which 37 countries have strong financial system.

Li and Xiaming (2005), the main aim of the study is to find the effect on FDI on economic growth. He used panel data from 84 countries from the year 1970-1995. The results that FDI contributes positive impact on economic growth by: human resource capital and efficiently use of technology. Eller et.al (2006) collected data from 11 Eastern European countries to find the effect of financial sector FDI on economic growth for the period 1996 to 2003. The study pinpoints that FDI effect economic growth.

Chowdhury and Mavrotas (2006) The study concluded that there is uni-directional causality in Chile while, directionality causality between GDP and FDI in case of Malaysia and Thailand. Pournarakis and Axarloglou (2007) collected the data from 1974-1994 to find the actual impact of FDI on economic growth. The study explains that its impact varies from sector to sector. However, the results indicated the key importance of the specific industries characteristics in evaluating the effects of inflow of FDI on domestic communities.

Yousaf et.al (2008), measured the monetary blow of FDI in Pakistan. Time span for the data was from 1973 to 2002. The study concludes that FDI have negative impact with export in short run but has positive impact with export in long-run.

Mum et.al (2008), simple OLS method is used analyzed the data and the result concluded the positive relationship between two variables.

Borensztein et.al (1998), analyzed the impact of FDI on economic growth and take in 69 countries in his study. The outcomes inferred that FDI contribute more to development

as contrast to domestic investment. In his study he also explains the growth impact of FDI as dependent to individual assets stock and economic growth.

Agarwal (2000), found in his study that, expansion of FDI in South Asian Countries (SAC) was in relationship of the exponential speculation of the domestic speculators, which provides support of relationship between GDP and FDI and hence manipulate that, GDP on FDI was adverse at the end of 1980. In the preceding years, the relationship was slightly positive in the late years of 80s and 90s.

Ang (2008), study the FDI growth nexus in Malaysia for understanding the relationship between FDI, Financial and economic growth. Time series data from 1965-2004 were used and the results show that FDI, financial development are positively correlated with economic growth in the long-run. The study also indicates that uni-directionality exists between growth to FDI in long run.. Ang (2009) studied the role of FDI and financial development in Thailand by applying time series annual data from the period 1970 to 2004. The study suggests that favorable financial systems in an economy results in getting additional benefits of FDI. Result of this study tells that financial development encourages economic growth whereas output growth in the long run impacts negatively through FDI. Data of 126 developing countries from 1985 to 2002 is analyzed in order to check the effect of FDI and portfolio investment on economic growth de Vita and Kyaw (2009) concluded that positive relationship exists between FDI and economic growth.

Adam and Tweneboah (2009), studied the independent relationship between stock market and FDI for Ghana .Data span for the study is from years 1991 to 1996. VECM method has been applied. The study concluded that FDI have positive impact on stock market and relationship between FDI and stock market of Ghana is valuable in long run for the country.

Choong and Lim (2009), scrutinize the endogenous growth model among FDI and financial growth in Malaysia from 1970-2005. The results of the study imply that FDI, investment, labor and government expenditure play a key role in domestic economic

prosperity. Furthermore, the study illustrates that FDI and financial growth jointly contribute a significant effect on Malaysia economy.

Wu and Chiang (2008), were interested to find out that, if FDI support economic development process. Threshold regression technique is used for conducting the study. The results, of the study conclude that FDI plays a key and defining role in economic development. These results were obtained from analyzing 62 countries from the year 1975 to 2000. The study provides evidence that FDI depend on GDP and human capital. In addition to, Alfaro et.al (2004), similar study has been conducted to explore the link between FDI and GDP. The study also provides information that, strong financial system is more capable for exploiting the FDI. Span of the data is from 1975 to 1995 and therefore, conclude that strong financial system had larger impact of FDI in countries.

Saleeem (2010), used time span from the year 1980-2006 for Pakistan. The data is get from the IMF to inspect the liaison between FDI and monetary growth. Two econometric techniques is used first one, is OLS method and second one is the granger causality test. The result is states that relationships exist between the variables and there is uni-directionality flow from foreign inflow to monetary expansion.

Shahbaz and Rahman (2010), studies the role of forign capital on economic growth for Pakistan. Time series data is taken from World Bank and Economic survey from 1971-2008 Variability of the data is taken from WDI and, used ARDL model to check the relationships between the variables. The result tells that forign inflow has a relationship with economic growth.

2.2.2 Inflation (INF) and economic growth

Moltey (1994), studied the relationship between inflation and economic growth. He further extend the model of Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992) which is based on Solow growth model by allowing the possibility that inflation probably tend to reduce the rate

of technological change. The results show negative relationship between inflation and economic growth.

Barro (1995), studied shows the negative relationship between inflation and economic growth. Sample size of the study is large from years 1960 to 1990 to examine the effects of inflation on economic growth. System of regression equation technique is used in which other variables are assumed constant to find the actual change between inflation and economic growth. In addition to, Barro and Martin (1995), the result concludes negative relationship between inflation and economic growth. The study also explains that if inflation raise by 10% per year the projected Real GDP will be decreased by 0.2% to 0.3% per years respectively.

Mubarik (2005), conducted the study to calculate the threshold level of Pakistan economy using time series annual data for the period of 1973 to 2010. From the study he concluded and suggested that above 9% threshold level of inflation is harmful for Pakistan economy. Panel data of 140 developed and developing economics for the period 1960-1998 is undertaken and recommended that 1-3 % threshold for Pakistan and 7-11% threshold for the developed economics respectively.

Munir et.al (2009), finds the unpredictable relationship between inflation and economic growth for the period of 1970 to 1975 for Malaysian economy and concludes significant relationship between inflation and economic growth.

Abbas et.al (2011), used the panel data to find relationship between FDI, inflation (CPI) and economic growth for SAARC countries. Positive relationship exists between FDI and GDP while negative between FDI and inflation. Multiple Regression models are used for the study. Sample size of the data is from year 2001 to 2010.

Enormous empirical evidence that supports the findings of Mundell (1963) and Tobin (1965), that positive relationship exists between economic growth and inflation. Malik and Chowdhury (2001) statistically analysis also supports that positive relationship exist

between two variables. To obtain the result they used the co-integration and error correction model to analyze the data for 04 south Asian countries (Pakistan, India, Sri Linka, Bangladesh), and found positive relationship between inflation and economic growth. They concluded that moderate inflation is helpful to boost up the economic growth. Different empirical literature also exhibits the positive relationship between economic growth and inflation below threshold level of inflation. Ghosh and Philips (1998), found that if inflation is (less than 2-3 percent) the relationship between inflation and economic growth will be positive. Similarly Fabayo and Ajilore (2006), investigated the existence of threshold impact in inflation growth on Nigeria using time series annually data for the period of 1970 to 2003. The findings concluded that 06 percent level of inflation as a threshold. Inflation and economic growth has positive relationship below 06 percent threshold level of inflation. Furthermore, Wang Zhiyong (2008), concluded that economic growth is positively related with inflation with 03 quarter lag. Co-integration and ECM are used to get the results.

On the other hand, several empirical studies found that inflation and economic growth have zero relationship. Like Sidrauski (1967), found that inflation has insignificant relationship with 13 growths in the long-run. Furthermore, the author testifies the neutrality of money in his model. In the addition to Sirdauski, Bruno & Easterly (1995), studies demonstrate that there is no association between inflation and economic growth. For example Christoffersen and Doyel (1998), identified that below 13 percent threshold level of inflation no relationship between inflation and economic growth but above the level there is negative relationship between the two variables.

2.2.3 Domestic Saving (DS) and economic growth

Economists have known from the longtime that growth rate and saving have positive related across the countries. Franco Modigliani (1970), and Hendrik S. Houthakkar (1961, 1965), introduced the initial empirical evidence long years ago, and proceeding research papers have proved the correlation. Latest revival in the empirical studies on the

determinants of economic growth have stronger the early findings. Vast empirical studies and literature have been conducted to find the empirical relationship between economic growth and Domestic Saving (DS) which gives different based on country, methodology & time span. The positive relationship has been generally interpreted and supported by standard growth models in which high saving leads to temporarily high growth (Solow 1956). Moreover, the evidence implies that this saving-to-growth causation is the only key factor which is responsible for the positive relationship between saving and growth across different countries. Literature reviews also support the positive relationship between saving and economic growth. First growth in saving is the prime factor that can stimulate growth through channel of investment. This argument is supported by Hadd (1939), Domer (1946), Solow (1956), model of growth. Empirical studies by Alguacil et al.(2004**),** and Singh (2009),noted that through Solow's growth model, we get more savings which help us in boost up economic growth. Countries need to be increased their saving by increasing income. Yearly data has been taken of Marxian economy from 1997 to 2000. Pair-wise Granger causality method has been carry out to test the directionality among savings and economic growth. The result of the conducted study support the Solow's growth model that higher saving contributes to economic growth which means there is a causal-relationship among saving and economic growth. Secondly, economic growth encourage saving. This hypothesis is supported by empirical findings of Sinha and Sinha (1998), Agarwal (2001), and Anoruo and Ahmed (2001), and Narayan (2006).

Katiricioglu and Naraliyeva (2006), estimated that saving and economic growth is positively correlated and there is a unidirectional causality from saving to economic growth for Kazakhstan economy. Odhiambo (2009), found out that there is a bi-directionality between domestic saving and real income for South Africa economy.

Khan, Hasan and Malik (1992) examined the relationship between Foreign Capital Investment (FCI) and saving and therefore, concluded that FCI is the driving force of decreasing saving in Pakistan economy during the time period of 1959 to 1988.

2.2.4 Gross Capital Formation (GCF) and economic growth

To investigate the statistical relationship between Gross Capital Formation (GCF) and economic growth, Jhingan (2006) focused in his study that capital formation not only enhances the investment in capital equipment which leads to increase in production but also create job opportunities. He further explains that capital formation give kick to technical growth which leads to economics of large scale of production amplifies specialization and/or thus provides tools, machines and equipment which enhance growth of labor force. Capital formation also facilitate in market growth. Also he highlights that capital formation facilitate to remove market imperfections by the creation of social and economic overheads capital, as a result breaks the vicious circle of poverty from both demand and supply side. Even in case of increasing population capital formation makes the growth possible. In the least developing countries e.g in sub-Sahara Africa increase in the per capita output is directly related to increase in capital-labor ratio. There are two main problems regarding raising the capital- labor ratio: (i) Capital-labor ratio declines with increase in population due to which large net investment is needed to control the capital- labor ratio. (ii) When population is increasing quickly, it becomes difficult to have sufficient saving for the given quantity of investment, which is the main reason that Marginal Propensity to Save (MPS) is low in developing countries. The only solutions to these problems is to quickly increase the rate of capital formation (loc.cit)

Capital formation has been ban to the development and economic growth of the peripheral countries. From the previous literature, the macro economic problems are facing the developing countries such as: high foreign debt; balance of payment (BOP) etc. (Op.cit).

Identifying the ban of capital formation, shuaib, Ekeria and Ogedengbe, (2015) investigated the impact of fiscal policy on economic growth of Nigerian economy by using yearly time series data from t 1960-2012. The study tested the stationarity of the data through group unit root test, and found stationarity at first difference at 05% level of significance. Two econometric techniques Co-integration Technique and Pairwise-Granger Causality were employed to find the long-run relationship status between the variables.

According to the study of Shuaib, Ekeria and Ogedengbe (2015), establish the actual impact of inflation on economic growth in case of Nigeria. Annually data is taken from 1960-2012. The results showed that there is no cointegration relationship between inflation and economic growth in Nigeria. Furthermore, causality relationships were also examined that exists between the two variables by applying the Pairwise-Granger causality at 02 lag periods.

According to Sarkar (2006), the study concluded that there is no relationship between stock capitalization and GCF. In the addition to, Orji and Mba (2011), studied the relationship between Foreign Private Investments (FPI), Capital Formation (CF) and growth for Nigeria by using two-stage least square (2SLS) method for estimation of the variables. The result indicates that there is a stronger long run impact of capital formation and FPI as compared to short run impact. There is long-run equilibrium exists between the variables as well as Error Correction term (ECM) is statistically significant but the speed of adjustment is small between two models. The results of two-least square (2SLS) estimates are close to Ordinary least square (OLS) estimates, resulting that estimates of (OLS) are unbiased and consistent. Therefore, endogeneity does not exist in the estimated model. There is no simultaneity existing among GDP growth and capital formation in estimated model. The findings also have some policy implications as discussed in the work.

Adekunle and Aderemi (2012), studied the relationship among Capital Formation (CF), Domestic Investment (DI) and population growth for the Nigerian economy by using secondary data taken from the central bank of Nigeria, for capital expenditure bank credit, capacity utilization and capital formation, while investment and growth rates are downloaded from world economic data base. The empirical findings show that rate of investment does not assist with growth rate of GDP per capita in Nigeria. The paper is estimated on the curve estimation regression model which indicates, that growth exists which is found to be statistically insignificant. The finding indicates the importance of government expenditure, bank credit, and capital utilization in increasing the real income of Nigeria. The results also imply, that there is statistically negative relationship between capital formation and growth rate of population. Based on the estimated curve estimation results, the rate of investment can stimulate growth in the economy slowly but, on a linear path.

2.3 Literature Comments

Finally; to sum up, the results we still ambiguous in the relationship between FDI and economic growth. Some of them show the positive relationship while, some shows the negative relationship, therefore we can be investigate it relationship between them.

CHAPTER 3

OVERVIEW OF FDI POLICY IN PAKISTAN

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides review of the FDI policy in Pakistan from the period 1947 to 2013. It discusses the historical trends of FDI with facts, figures and graphs with reliable resources.

3.2 Overview of FDI in Pakistan

Pakistan gained independence in the year 1947. At that time period, average economic growth rate was higher as compared to world economy. In 1960s Pakistan was thought to be a role model in terms of economic development in Asia, and achieved much more success in economic growth.

Concrete, strong and friendly investment policies of countries always give opportunities to the overseas investors to invest in those countries. These policies represent the true pictures of the host countries and also guide the overseas investors in the right areas where they need it the most.

In last twenty years Pakistan received high amount of FDI inflow mainly during the decade of 1990s. Favorable environment for investment, market-oriented policy are the central reasons of receiving bulk quantity of FDI in Pakistan.

The measurement of FDI inflow in Pakistan can be briefly explained in terms of percentage and size of Gross Capital Formation (GCF). The cume of FDI inflow in Pakistan was not progressive until 1991 because of regularity framework policy. It has been observed that FDI inflow is stable in post –liberalization policy. (Table: 01) Actually the inflows of FDI have increased from $41 million in year (1970-74) to $5009 million in (1990-99). However, the speed of FDI inflows in Pakistan has remained slower as compared to developing countries in Asia.

Table 3.1: FDI Net inflow in Pakistan (1970-2000)

Period	**1970-74**	**1975-79**	**1980-84**	**1985-89**	**1990-99**	**2000**
Value ($ millions)	41	138	322	764	5009	308
% GCF	0.53	0.98	1.22	2.31	4.75	3.17

Source: *world development indicator*

In the era of 1970's, the trade policies of Pakistan have been swung between import substitution and export promotion. In early 70's Pakistan went to nationalization policy and become the biggest player in the economy. In 90's Pakistan changed the strategy and opened its economy to allow the foreign investors to invest in.

1n 1960's, the marked role of local and private sector in terms of major services of insurances, banking and commerce slowed down the foreign investment. The foreign investment was restricted in the areas of banking, commerce, and insurance in early 60's. In 70's, the overseas investors were badly effects due to nationalization policy and extreme regulation of commerce and trade from the government side.

The policy of nationalization could not achieve the target results to the government in terms of economic growth. Due to the failure of nationalized organizations the government softened the strategy and allowed the overseas investors to invest in the country. At the Initial stage the investors was only allowed in participating joint equity participation with domestic investors and targeting multiple areas like technical skills, advanced technology and marketing knowledge. In 1980's, government showed additional interest and introduced Export Promotion Zone (EPZ) to facilitate export-oriented industries. However, government encouraged Pakistani overseas to send their investments in Export Promotion Zone (EPZ) on non- repairable speculation basis.

The results of the services provided by the government diminished because of the highly strict policies and laws. The restrictions included: strict licensing, high public ownership, hug taxes imposition and price control from government of Pakistan. In the end 80's and early 90's Pakistan tried to control these barriers and give free hand to investors to invest

in, providing effortless relaxing policies for licensing and registration and for starting new business which is given to the local or domestic investors. Liberalization, of foreign exchange also encourages FDI in Pakistan because overseas investors were given space to invest in, posses and take out the foreign currency and hold certificates of foreign currency.

Special Industrial Zones (SIZs), were also another milestone in history of Pakistan. In SIZs both foreign Pakistani and foreign investors were appreciated to participate. In New investment policy agriculture and services sector was also permitted to participate in it which was not before allowed in foreign investment. This policy has boost inflow of FDI in Pakistan.

As mentioned by the investment board of Pakistan the magnitude of FDI in 2000-2001 was 485$ million and it consistently increased in next six (06) years. In 2007-2008 it reached figure of $5409 million. In 2011-2012 it starts decreasing. There are multiple of reasons behind the declined of FDI inflows. The key important reasons are the global financial crises, political instability and terrorist attacks. The inflow of FDI is shown below in Table-2

Table 3.2: Foreign Direct Investment ($millions)

Years	Green Field Investment	Privatization proceeds	Total FDI
2001-2002	357.00	128.00	485.00
2002-2003	622.00	176.00	798.00
2003-2004	750.00	199.00	949.00
2004-2005	1116.00	363.00	1524.00
2005-2006	4873.60	1540.00	5139.60
2006-2007	4873.60	133.20	5409.80
2007-2008	3719.20	-	3719.90
2008-2009	2150.80	-	2150.80

2010-2011	1634.80	-	1634.80
2011-2012	812.60	-	812.60
2012-2013	621.90	-	621.90
Total	**23960.80**	**2805.60**	**26766.40**

Source: *Board of investment Pakistan*

Fig 3.1: Graphically inflow of FDI in Pakistan (2000-2013)



In 2004, there is significant increase in the FDI inflows. In 2007-2008 the FDI reached $5.15 billion which is approximately 443% as compared to 2004. Privatization is the vital reasons behind this massive increase of FDI inflows which support the green field investment. Due to the privatization the lack of infrastructure of Pakistan dominated on green field investment which creates job opportunities in banking and telecom sector. Therefore, the capital formation improved.

In comparison to other developing countries, the contribution of FDI in Pakistan is not quite impressive. Capital inflow of FDI in Pakistan was 4% in 2007, as it was 7.5% in other developing countries. The foremost reasons behind this tiny contribution of FDI inflows were political and economic instability, unfriendly business environment, conflict between the government and foreign investors, lack of infrastructures, terrorism e.t.c.

DATA DESCRIPTION AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The chapter explains data description, steps and procedures used in the empirical studies for investigating the long-run and short-run relationship between economic growth and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Trade Openness (TO), Total Debt (TD), Inflation (INF), Domestic Saving (DS), Gross Capital Formation (GCF) and causality between Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and economic growth estimation techniques.

4.2 Data

The study employs secondary data. Time series annual data on FDI, TO, TD, INF, DS, GCF and real GDP growth rate from Pakistan over the period 1975 to 2013 are used in the study. Data obtained from two sources, both deemed reliable, World Bank indicators (2016) and Inflation data. Com. The study uses the computer software E-views for applying the econometric analysis.

Table 4.1 Variables along with proxy and Expected Sign

Variables	Proxy	Expected Sign	Source
Dependent variable			
Economic Growth (Real GDP)	GDP (Constant 2005 US$)		World Bank indicators
Independent variables			
Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)	FDI, net inflows (Bop, current US $)	Positive (+)	World Bank indicators
Trade Openness (TO)	Trade as percentage of GDP	Positive (+)	World Bank indicators
Total Debt (TD)	Total Debt Service(% of GDP)	Negative (-)	World Bank indicators
Inflation (INF)	Consumer Price Index(CPI)	Positive (+)	Inflationdata.com
Domestic Saving (DS)	Gross Domestic Saving as percentage of GDP	Positive (+)	World Bank indicators

Gross Capital Formation (GCF)	(Constant 2005 US$)	Positive (+)	World Bank indicators
Dum1 (Political Instability)	To investigate the impact of martial law (Political Instability) on economic growth of Pakistan.		
Dum2 (Political Stability)	To investigate the impact of democracy (Political Stability) on economic growth of Pakistan.		

4.3 Definition and Justification of the Selected Variables

4.3.1 Economic Growth (GDP)

The GDP is one of the most important variable for measuring the performance/economic growth/health of the country economy**.** It is defines, as the total dollar market value of all the final goods and services produced within geographical boundary of a country over a period of one (01) year. GDP represents the volume of the economy.

4.3.2 Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)

FDI is defined as the sum of the capital equity, re-investment of earning and other short-term and long-term capital as expressed in balance of payment. It provides facilities of technology, employment and innovations which is best forecaster for economic growth of country.

4.3.3 Trade Openness (TO)

It is defined as the policy of economics that either limit or magnetize trade between countries.

4.3.4 Total Debt (TD)

The sum of principle amount and interest on short and long term debt is called total debt. High total debt is problematic for macro economy.

4.3.5 Inflation (INF)

The change in prices of basket of goods and services that are typically purchased by specific groups of households. Inflation is deeming as important indicator for economic

growth and relationship exist between GDP & inflation in most of the literature. The proxy for the inflation is Consumer Price Index (CPI).

4.3.6 Domestic Saving (DS)

It is defined as the physical contribution of investment while calculating GDP in the measurement of country economic activity. It is the one of important factor of GDP because it measures the future productivity capacity of the nation.

4.3.7 Gross Capital Formation (GCF)

The cost which accrued entirely on long term assets, replacement of long term asset (land, building, machinery, drains, plant equipment, fences & engineering work). It includes in the expenditure of GDP and thus showing that how much new stock is invested rather than consumed in the economy.

`4.4 Model and Methodology

4.4.1 Model of the study

Broadly, in this study a model of empirical relationship between Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Trade Openness (TO), Total Debt (TD), Inflation (INF), Domestic Saving (DS) and Gross Capital Formation (GCF) was developed to execute the long run and short run analysis for Pakistan's economic growth and to check the granger causality between FDI and economic growth. Based on studies of (Saqib et al., 2013) uses the below model expressing the relationship between FDI and economic growth. The following model will analyze the empirically relationship implicitly stated as follows:

$$\mathrm{GDP} = \mathrm{f}(\mathrm{FDI}, \mathrm{TO}, \mathrm{TD}, \mathrm{INF}, \mathrm{DS}, \mathrm{GCF}, \mathrm{DUM}, \mathrm{DUM2}) \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots \mathrm{eq}(4.1)$$

The equation (4.1) is transformed into linear function consequently:

$$\mathrm{GDP_t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathrm{FDI_t} + \beta_2 \mathrm{TO_t} + \beta_3 \mathrm{TD_t} + \beta_4 \mathrm{INF_t} + \beta_5 \mathrm{DS_t} + \beta_6 \mathrm{GCF_t} + \mathrm{DUM_t} + \mathrm{DUM_{2t}} + \varepsilon_t \ldots\ldots\ldots \mathrm{eq}\ (4.2)$$

Where,

GDP_t = Gross Domestic Product at time t

FDI_t = Foreign Direct Invetment at time t

TO_t = Trade Openenss at time t

TD_t = Total Debt at time t

INF_t = Inflation at time t

GDI_t = Domestic Investment t

GCF_t = Gross Capital Formation at time t

DUM_t = Dictatorship (Martial Law)

DUM_{2t} =Democracy (Rehabilitation of Political instability)

B_0 = the slope or the constant of the model

$B_1 - B_6$ = cofficient of the explanantory variables in the model

ε_t = error term

The entire variables are transformed into natural logarithm to lessen the affect of heteroscedasticity in the time series data, if there exists.

$$\ln GDP_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln FDI_t + \beta_2 \ln TO_t + \beta_3 \ln TD_t + \beta_4 \ln INF_t + \beta_5 \ln DS_t + \beta_6 \ln GCF_t + DUM_t + DUM_{2t} + \varepsilon_t \ldots \ldots \ldots . eq(4.3)$$

4.4.2 Empirical Framework

Independent Variables

- Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)
- Trade Openness (TO)
- Total Debt (TD)
- Inflation (INF)
- Gross Domestic Investment (GDI)
- Gross Capital Formation (GCF)

→ Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

4.4.3 Unit Root Test for stationarity (ADF and PP)

Most of economic data are having unit root (i.e are not stationary) and this result as the problem of spurious regression. In order to avoid this problem the study performs a test for stationarity for the time series data using the ADF and PP tests. To optimum leg length for ADF test will be determined by Schwarz information criterian (SIC). When there is unit root in the data, the corresponding time series will be considered non-stationary. The formal ADF test procedure can be presented by the following equation.

$$\Delta X_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t + \beta X_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \delta j \Delta X_{t-1} + U_t \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots eq(4.4)$$

WhereΔX_t denotes first difference of the time series data while ρ represent the lag order and t is representing time. In the ADF result, we will reject the null hypothesis that variable(x) is nonstationary ($H_O: \beta = 0$) if β is significantly negative.

The Philips-Perron (PP) test on the other hand will also be employed due to its additional advantage over the ADF test as it was adjusted to do away with the assumption that the error terms are serially independent and include serial correlation through the use of the Newey-West (1994) covariance matrix. In the PP test the order of integration in our variables are based on the test which includes both the intercept and time trend. We can therefore present the general form of the test using the following equation:

$$X_t = a_1 + b_2 X_{t-1} + a_3 (t + \frac{T}{2}) + \mu_t \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots eq(4.5)$$

Where a_1, a_2, a_3 are the coefficients of the regression while T is the number of observations in the model. Here we also test the null hypothesis that the series are having unit root against alternative that assumes the opposite.

If our model is found non stationary at level, they will be converted to first difference in order to achieve their stationarity and the null hypothesis will be tested at conventional 1%, 5% and 10% level of significance.

The assumptions of ARDL bound test is that all variables should be stationary at I(0) and I(1) therefore, before applying the bond test we should check the level of stationarity of the data. The reason behind is to confirm that variables are not I(2) to avoid the spurious results. If the variables are integrated of order I(2) bound test approach will however crash.

4.4.4 ARDL Model Specification

After estimating the level of integration of the variables the next step is to find the short run and long run dynamics relationship among the variables of interest. For that we apply the bound test approach within the framework of Autoregressive Disttrubted lag (ARDL) model purposed by Pesaran et al. (2001) to investigate the presence of cointegration among the variables.

The methodology of bound test is chosen for multiple of reasons. (i) ARDL avoids the problem of level of integration of same order as connected with Johansen likelihood approach (1990). (ii) The conventional cointegration approach followed by stock and Watson (1988), Johansen and Juselius (1990) is best for large small size data while, bound test procedure is best for estimating the small size study Pesaran et al. (2001). (iii) At the same time, we run the parameters of short run and long run of the model. (iv)The variables must be assumed endogenous. (v) This technique provides Un-biased estimates of the long run and suitable t-statistics (Harris and Sollis, 2003).

To apply the bound test procedure the following ARDL will be estimated to find the co-integration relationship between economic growth, FDI, TO, TD, INF, DS and GCF, we specify the following model:

$$\Delta lnGDP_t = \mathrm{C} + a_1\,\Delta lnRGDP_{t-1} + a_{1\,2}\Delta lnFDI + \alpha_{1\,3}\Delta lnTO + \alpha_{1\,4}\Delta lnTD + \alpha_{1\,5}\Delta lnINF + \alpha_{1\,6}\Delta lnDS + \alpha_{1\,7}\Delta lnGCF + \sum_{i=1}^{P}\alpha_{1i}\Delta lnGDP_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{q}\alpha_{2\,i}lnFDI_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{r}\alpha_{3\,i}lnTO_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\alpha_{4i}lnTD_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{w}\alpha_{5i}lnINF_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{x}\alpha_{6i}lnDS_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{z}\alpha_{7i}lnGCF_{t-1} + \mu_t \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots eq\ (4.6)$$

The initial step of ARDL approach is estimate the equation (4.6) by OLS. The second step is identifying the presence of cointegration among the variables by restricting all the estimated coefficients of the lagged variable equal to zero. Null hypothesis is that No cointegration exists ($H_0 = \alpha_{1i} = \alpha_{2i} = \alpha_{3i} = \alpha_{4i} = \alpha_{5i} = \alpha_{6i}$) while, alternative hypothesis is cointegration exists ($H_1 = \alpha_{1i} \neq \alpha_{2i} \neq \alpha_{3i} \neq \alpha_{4i} \neq \alpha_{5i} \neq \alpha_{6i}$).

4.4.5 Wald Test Coefficient Restriction

The Wald test coefficient restriction was used to restrict the variables in the model. It comes negative after calculating the equation. By performing Wald test estimation we get the F-statistics which is used the check the long-run relationship among the variables in the model. Computed F-statistics is compared with the critical bound value followed by person el. (2001). If the F-statistics is greater than the upper critical bound value the null hypothesis is rejected and therefore no cointegration exits. But if F-statistics is below the critical lower bound value then we will accept the null-hypothesis of no cointegration. However if the F-statistics lies between the upper and lower bound values, further knowledge about integration of the variables is required else, the conclusion of the cointegration status is inconclusive.

4.4.6 ECM

The relationship and ECM was introduced by Engle and Granger (1987). ECM mainly provides causal factors that are may influence the variables. The negative sign of ECM and statistically significant confirmed that long-run relationship can be achieved among the variables included in the model. This method is the easiest to confirm co-integration among the variables (Bannerjee et al. 1998). Error correction model (ECM) among the co-integrated variables explains change in dependent variables due to independent variable. The divergence in dependent variable shows short period of time to long run equilibrium relationship (Masih and Masih, 1997).

Now co-integration relationship exist between the variables, the next steps is estimate the equation (4.6) via ARDL technique by choosing the order of the model using Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) to achieve the short-run and long run dynamics parameters and Error correction from equation (4.7) is given as below:

$$\Delta \mathbf{lnGDP_t} = C_o + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{1i}\, \mathbf{ln}\Delta \mathbf{FDI_{t-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{2\,i}\, \mathbf{ln}\Delta \mathbf{TO_{t-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{3i}\, \mathbf{ln}\Delta \mathbf{TD_{t-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{4i}\, \mathbf{ln}\Delta \mathbf{INF_{t-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{5i}\, \mathbf{ln}\Delta \mathbf{DS_{t-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{6i}\, \mathbf{ln}\Delta \mathbf{GCF_{t-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_i\, \Delta \mathbf{D_{1_{t-1}}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \gamma_i\, \Delta \mathbf{D_{2_{t-1}}} + \mathbf{ECM_{t-1}} + \varepsilon_t \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots \mathbf{eq}\ (4.7)$$

4.4.7 Sensitivity Analysis

Diagnostic results, Ramsey's RESET, Normality **(**Jaurque-Bera test), Breusch-Godfrey Serial correlation LM TEST, ARCH TEST, Breusch-Godfrey Heterosedacity TEST are performed under the sensitivity analysis to confirmed the validity of the data used for the variables in the model.

4.4.8 Granger Causality Test

The test for Granger causality as argued by Granger (1969) implied that a time series variables is said to be ''Granger cause'' If and only if X cause Y to historical values of Y. Uni-directionality and bi-directionality can be differentiated by using granger causality. It is said to un-directional X to Y if X granger cause Y but Y does not granger X ($X \rightarrow Y$) while, bi-directionality exits X to Y if X granger cause Y and Y granger cause X($X \leftrightarrow Y$). If both variables do not cause each other then no-directionality exist between them and both are independent from each other.

System of equations is shown below:

$$x_t = {}_{\alpha_o} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i y_{t-1} + u_t \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots \text{eq (4.8)}$$

$$y_t = {}_{\alpha_o} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots \text{eq (4.9)}$$

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, two econometric models were identified; first of which was ARDL which examines the long-run and short-run dynamics relationship between FDI, and economic growth. This was the latent approach of cointegration proposed by Pesaran et al, (2001) that is not consistent but efficient in the sample case. Secondly the causality testing procedure by Granger (1969) within the Pairwise causality testing procedure was suggested for the estimation process.

This chapter therefore presents the results when the aforementioned econometric techniques were used to examine the long-run and short-run relationship between FDI and economic growth in Pakistan (1975-2013). The chapter is classified into seven sections. The first two sections provide the descriptive statistics and results of unit roots test respectively. The result of Bound test of cointegration will be presents in third sections. The four sections provide the findings of the pair-wise granger causality test and hypothesis testing. The six sections provide the diagnostic tests for the estimated model and the last sections present the Results discussions.

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

In descriptive statistics, the total number of observations for each variable is thirty nine and the study consists of annual time series data from 1975 to 2013. The variables were expressed in logarithmic to warrant interpretation as elasticities. The descriptive statistics of the variables included in the study are shown in Table 4.1 and affirm that the average lnGDP is 24.89 with standard deviation of 0.54. The average of the lnFDI is 19.55 with standard deviation of 1.62. lnTO has an average of 3.53 on with standard deviation 0.11. The average lnTD is 1.23 with standard deviation of 0.39. lnINF is 4.90 on an average with standard deviation 0.41. The mean of the lnDS is 2.37 with standard

deviation of 0.36. lnGCF is 23.35 on an average with standard deviation of 0.39. Skewness measures symmetry or more specifically, the lack of symmetry. Therefore, based on the result obtained below, all the variables are right skewed except lnINF.

Table 5.1: Descriptive Results

	lnGDP	**lnFDI**	**lnTO**	**lnTD**	**lnINF**	**lnDS**	**lnGCF**
Mean	24.89	19.55	3.53	1.23	4.90	2.37	23.35
Median	24.96	19.66	3.55	1.31	4.99	2.40	23.51
Maximum	25.69	22.42	3.83	1.89	5.45	2.86	23.92
Minimum	23.87	15.92	3.34	0.27	3.98	1.54	22.45
Std. Dev.	0.54	1.62	0.11	0.39	0.41	0.36	0.39
Skewness	-0.30	-0.22	0.47	-0.57	-0.67	-0.26	-0.63
Kurtosis	1.95	2.43	3.46	2.60	2.50	1.99	2.36
Jaurque-Bera	2.36	0.84	1.81	2.40	3.35	2.09	3.30
Probability	0.30	0.65	0.40	0.29	0.18	0.35	0.19
Observations	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
***Source**: Author computation*							

Kurtosis measure whether the data is peaked or flat as compared to a normal distribution. The kurtosis statistics of the variables shows that lnTO, lnTD, lnINF are leptokurtic (higher peak or long-tailed) while remaining variables are platykurtic (short-tailed or fat). These measurements of skewness and kurtosis combined to determine whether the variables follow a normal distribution. We can use Jaurque-Bera (JB) test for normality imply that residuals are normally disturbed. As all the variables Jaurque-Bera (Probability value) is greater than 0.05. Therefore, it is stated that the all the variables included the model are normally distrusted.

5.2 Unit Root Tests

Table 5.2 account the outcome of unit root test for the variable in the study. Results of Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) unit root test suggest that lnGDP, lnFDI, lnTO, lnDS, lnTD, lnGCF are non-stationary at level but become stationary at first difference; while lnINF is stationary at level. To summarize, all the variables are integrated at order I(1), except lnINF which is stationarity at level I(0).

To confirm test results, Phillips Perron (PP) test for unit root was conducted. The estimated results are in line with those obtained from ADF.

Table 5.2: Results of ADF and PP for Unit root

Variables	**Level**		**First Difference**	
	Constant	**Constant & Trend**	**Constant**	**Constant & Trend**
lnGDP	-2.5997 (1)	-1.5156 (1)	-3.8867** (0)	-4.7709** (0)
lnFDI	1.389 (0)	-3.354 (1)	-4.2775** (4)	-3.7637** (8)
lnTO	-2.3818 (0)	-3.0968 (0)	-6.2855** (0)	-6.1936** (0)
lnTD	-2.071 (0)	-2.331 (0)	-7.389** (0)	-7.305** (0)
lnINF	**-3.6582*** (2)**	**-4.7190*** (4)**	**-1.799 (0)**	**-2.662 (0)**
lnDS	2.527 (0)	1.918 (0)	-7.201** (0)	-7.228** (0)
lnGCF	-3.1073 (0)	-1.6010 (0)	-4.805** (0)	-5.1877** (0)

Results of Phillips Perron (PP) for Unit root

Variables	**Level**		**First Difference**	
	Constant	**Constant & Trend**	**Constant**	**Constant & Trend**
lnGDP	-3.170 (1)	-1.103 (1)	-3.900** (2)	-4.743** (1)
lnFDI	-1.390 (2)	-2.239 (0)	-5.821** (1)	-6.021** (1)
lnTO	-2.381 (0)	-3.096 (0)	-7.365** (8)	-6.851** (7)
lnTD	-2.010 (3)	-2.180 (2)	-7.421** (1)	-7.305** (0)
lnINF	**-5.4547*** (1)**	**-4.3255*** (9)**	**-1.9644 (1)**	**-1.9131 (4)**

lnDS	-2.547 (1)	-1.936 (2)	-7.543** (3)	-7.648** (7)
lnGCF	-2.9407 (1)	-1.6010 (0)	-4.799** (1)	-5.185** (2)

***Note**: *, ** and *** indicates stationary at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively*

***Source**: Extract from estimation output using E-views 9*

The above table indicates that all the variables are integrated of I(1) except lnINF which is I(0). Having mixture of order of integration lent credence for the usage of ARDL approach for test for cointegration.

5.3 Cointegration Test Results

In the absence of including variable of the higher order I(2) of the variables used in the equation them to examine whether there exists a long run relationship among the variables in the model using OLS technique and then conduct Wald test in Eviews 09. C F-statistics = 8.143978 is bigger than the critical upper bond value 3.99 at 01 percent level. so, the null hypothesis of cointegration rejected as per criteria.

Table 5.3: F-statistics for testing the existence of Long-run Cointegration

Country	**F-statistics**	**Lag length**	**Significance Level**	**Bound Critical Values**	
				I(0)	**I(1)**
Pakistan	8.143978	2	1%	2.88	3.99
			5%	2.27	3.28
			10%	1.99	2.94

***Note:** Critical values are obtained from Narayan. (2005)*

***Source**: extract from estimation output using Eviews 09*

5.4 Long Run Results

Once we found the long-run cointegration relationship among the variables of our study, equation (4.5) was calculated using the following ARDL (1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 0) specification. The results obtained by normalizing real GDP (lnGDP) in the long run are discuss in Table 5.4

Table 5.4: Long Run Estimation Results

Variables	Coefficient	Standard error	T-ratios	T-probability
C	46.515748	13.346173	3.485325	0.0025
LnFDI	0.181730	0.077942	2.331622**	0.0309
LnTO	0.389332	0.399145	0.975415	0.3416
LnTD	-0.156460	0.059871	-2.613299**	0.0171
LnINF	1.817235	0.463456	3.921054**	0.0009
LnDS	0.113687	0.077279	1.471117	0.1576
LnGCF	1.504438	0.738197	-2.037991**	0.0557
Political Instability (DUM1)	0.345482	0.159359	2.167946**	0.0431
Political Stability (DUM2)	0.239682	0.127844	1.874809	0.0763
R^2=0.999756				
Adjusted R^2=0.999538				
Schwarz Bayesian Criterion=-5.118792				
Akaike Info. Criterion=-5.902481				
F-stat=4585.788				
Prob. (F-statistics)=0.000				
DW-statistic=2.157644				
SER=0.010852				
RSS=0.002237				

Note: **** (**) indicates 10% (5%) significant level.*

Source*: extract from estimation output using Eviews 09*

The estimated coefficient of the long-run relationship shows that lnFDI has positive long-run impact on economic growth in Pakistan under the study review. This signifies that an increase in lnFDI will lead to increase in economic growth of Pakistan. Increase in 1% lnFDI leads increases 0.181730 % increase in economic growth. Interestingly, t-statistics shows the variable is significant at 5 percent level of significance as the

probability value is less than 0.05 (p-value < 0.05). From the statistically results, it is confidently conclude that lnFDI has positive and significant impact on economic growth of Pakistan.. The result corroborated the findings of Chuhday et al (2010) and Mahmood & Sohail (2007).

Considering the impact of Trade Openness (lnTO), it has the positive impact on economic growth as projected. However, its contribution is minimal for the period under study. This implies that as lnTO increases, economic growth follows suit. The decision is based on the probability value of the lnTO which is greater than 0.05 (p-value > 0.05). The estimated coefficient 0.3416 indicates long-run lnTO elasticity for economic growth is inelastic. The result is consistent with Maku (2013) & Nduka (2013).

Similarly, the impact of Total Debt (lnTD) on economic growth is significant at 5% t-probability value and has the expected inverse sign. A 1 % rise in lnTD will cause 0.156460 declines in economic growth. The result is in conformity with the findings of (Amjad & khan, 2004).

However, Inflation (lnINF) seems to negate the apriori expectation. The estimated long-run model shows that inflation has some positive linkage on economic growth. This indicates that increases in inflation will lead to increase in the economic growth in case of Pakistan. More technically, if inflation increases by 1 percent, economic growth will increase by 1.817325%. T-statistics is significant at 01% level of significance as the probability value is less than 0.05 (p-value < 0.05). The result is inveterate by (Ali and Hussain, 2001).

Domestic Saving (lnGS) also shows positive impact on growth, but statistically insignificant relationship with economic growth in Pakistan under the period reviewed. Furthermore, 1 % increase in lnDS leads to 0.113687% increase in economic growth. Positive linkage between (lnDS) and economic growth is also confirmed by previous study Tang and Lean (2013).

Moreover, Gross Capital Formation (lnGCF) has positive long-run relationship with economic growth at statistically at 5% significant level. Interestingly, this indicates that 1 percent increase in lnGCF leads to 1.504438 increases in economic growth of Pakistan. The study is confirmed with preceding literature Muhammad et. al. (2010).

It is common knowledge from the literature that economic growth and political instability is deeply interconnected with each other. On the one hand, political instability and economic growth are directly linked with unstable political environment which eventually shrink the speed of economic growth. On the other hand, slow financial growth might lead bad governance and political disturbance. However, in Pakistan, DUM (Political Instability) is a puzzling relationship with economic growth. The estimate obtained shows that dictatorship have positive impact on economic growth. The dummy variable estimate of 0.342 is perhaps as a result of commitment to governance. During the regime of Zia-Ul-Haq, the overall macroeconomic performance increased tremendously. This is evidenced by GDP growth to about 154% with average growth rate of 6.5%, electricity production increased up to 200%. Similarly, inflation decreased from 13% to 7% and unemployment decreased by 27% (Shah, 2013).

In the time period of democracy DUM2 (Political Stability) has also positive but weak impact on economic growth. This insignificant relationship can be attributed to bitter conflict between the political parties, weak democratic institutions and structures. It was observed that GDP declined by 2% and production of electricity marginally by 8% compared to period Zia period. Inflation increased to 15% during the period of democracy, while unemployment decreased by 18% (Shah, 2013)

5.5 Short Run Results

The numerical outcome of the ECM illustration of the chosen ARDL model was obtained from equation (4.6) and accounted in table 5.7. Coefficient with Δ sign explains short-run elasticity. Results indicate that (ΔLFDI) is a key contributor to economic growth in both short and long-run periods in Pakistan. The estimated parameter of

ΔLFDI is 0.02689 with P-Value of 0.0022. Therefore, it can be asserted that FDI meaningfully promotes economic growth at the chosen level of significance (0.05).

Interestingly, all our scale variables are largely in agreement with the research expectations. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Trade Openness (ΔLTO), Total Debt (ΔLTD), Domestic Saving (ΔLDS) and Gross Capital Formation (ΔLGCF) are positive functions of economic growth. In the same vein, Inflation (ΔLINF) show negative expected sign in short-run. All dummy variables have positive impact on economic growth in short run.

The ECM was obtained as (-0.144661) which is negative and significant at 5% level of significance in tandem with theory. The negative sign of error term means that errors in the short run converge or adjust towards long run equilibrium with the speed of 14 percent. In other words, errors are corrected in the present period and tied to long run equilibrium with 14% magnitude. The statistical value of the Durbin-Watson is 2.3434971 which indicate that no auto correlation exists between the variables. The value of R^2 is 0.764561 which suggests that 76% percent change in variation in dependent variable is due to independent variables. Adjusted R^2 is 0.553905. F-statistics value is 3.629429. Therefore, we conclude that the variables are jointly significant at 5% level and with good fit.

Table 5.5: Short Run Results

Variables	**Coefficient**	**Standard error**	**T-ratio**	**T-probability**
ΔLDS	0.067903	0.015351	4.423441***	0.0003
ΔLGCF	0.048263	0.050174	0.961898	0.3482
ΔLGCF(-1)	-0.105993	0.059583	-1.778903	0.0913
ΔLINF	-0.020504	0.246613	0.083142	0.9346
Δ LINF(-1)	-0.354217	0.217908	-1.625538	0.1205
Δ LTD	0.015572	0.009566	1.627940	0.1200

Δ LTO	0.028133	0.035041	0.802867	0.4320
Δ LTP(-1)	0.042932	0.036397	1.179549	0.2527
Δ LFDI	0.026289	0.007442	3.532345***	0.0022
ΔDUM1(Political Instability)	0.049978	0.012566	3.977374***	0.0008
ΔDUM2 (Political stability)	0.034673	0.014078	2.462946***	0.0235
ECM(-1)	-0.144661	0.056193	-2.574359**	0.0186
R-Squared=0.764561 Adjusted R-square=0.553905 F-stat=3.629429 SER=0.013965 RSS=0.003706 DW-statistic=2.1434971 Akaike Info. Criterion=-5.397972 Schwarz Bayesian Criterion=-4.614282				

Note: **** (**) indicates at 1% (5%) significance level.*

Source: *extract from estimation output using E-views 09*

5.6 Pair-wise Granger Causality Test

Once the relationship among FDI and Economic Growth has been established. Now we find the Pairwise Granger-causality between (LnFDI) and Economic Growth (EG). To check whether LEG cause LFDI or LFDI cause LEG in case of Pakistan we conducted Granger causality test.

Table: 5.6 Pair-wise Results

Pair wise Granger Causality test Sample 1975-2013 Lag: 2

Direction of Causality	F-value	P-value	Decision
LEG ⟶ LFDI	5.778	0.0072**	LEG cause LFDI
LFDI ⟶ LEG	1.987	0.1537	LFDI does not cause LEG

Note: *Selection of lag length can be chosen based on minimum AIC.*

*(**) indicates at (5%) significance level*

Source: *extract from estimation output using E-views 09*

The results reveal that there is uni directionality relationship between LEG and LFDI in case of Pakistan. Based on table: 5.8, the F-statistic is 5.778 imply that it is statistically significant at 05% level of significance. As outcome, the null hypothesis (LEG) does not cause (LFDI) is rejected. On the other hand, the null hypothesis that LFDI does not "Granger cause" LEG is accepted by the low F-statistics value of 1.987. So, the Granger causality confirms uni directionality causality running from LEG to LFDI. The study is confirmed with previous literature Dritsaki, et al. (2004).

The result of the Granger causality confirms that economic growth has key important impact on FDI. Thus growth exerts positive impact on LFDI, via LEG as a proxy in Pakistan.

5.7 Diagnostic Tests for ARDL

Table 5.7: Diagnostic/sensitative checking Results

TEST	PROBABILITY
Ramey's RESET	0.6832
Jaurque-Bera TEST	0.6306
Breusch-Godfrey Serial correlation LM TEST	0.2391
ARCH TEST	0.6275
Breusch- Godfrey Heterosedacity TEST	0.3503

Source: *extract from estimation output using E-views 09*

Figure 5.1: Plot of CUSUM and CUSUM for coefficient stability for ECM model



RESET Test stands for Regression Specification Error Test propounded by Ramsey in 1969. This test is meant to test whether errors in the model follow a multivariate normal distribution. Since the estimated probability (0.6832) is greater than 0.05, we conclude that the model is well specified and without significant omitted variables. Similarly, test of normality: Jaurque-Bera suggests that the model is normally distributed with mean zero given that probability 0.6306 is greater than the 0.05. Serial correlation LM test also confirms that the residuals is white noise i.e serially uncorrelated (0.2391 > 0.05). The diagnostic further reveals the validity of our estimated parameter as our model is homoscedastic (0.3503 > 0.05). As a result, we conclude that the errors converge in the long-run (No heteroscedasticity). Finally, evidences from ARCH shows that the error terms do not follow a specific pattern and size. Therefore, they are white noise given that the P value 0.6275 is greater than 0.05.

The CUSUM and CUSUMSQ tests specify that the model is consistent and constant over time. Since, the plotted recursive residuals at 5% are within the prescribed reliable range or critical lines, we conclude that the parameters are stable. The second test: CUSUMSQ confirms that our coefficients are exhibit consistency/constancy over time

Following the above results, we can confidently conclude that underlying ARDL is well specified, identified, homoscedastic with white noise error terms and stable for the period estimated. This confirms that the estimated parameters are unbiased and valid. Thus, it can be used as a reasonable policy document for Pakistan.

5.8 Hypothesis Testing:

From the entire test carried out with different diagnostic tests, it was revealed that FDI, TD, INF and GCF null hypothesis were rejected (t-value>2) i.e., there is no significant relationship between FDI, TD, INF and GCF and/ or accepted the alternative hypothesis (i.e, there is relationship between FDI, TO, INF, GCF and economic growth). Rejecting the null hypothesis confidently concludes that Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and its components have significant relationship with economic growth in Pakistan.

Also in the Granger Causality test, it is affirmed that null hypothesis (i.e., LEG does not granger cause LFDI) and or accepted the alternative hypothesis (i.e., LEG does granger cause LFDI). Rejecting the null hypothesis concludes that LEG granger cause LFDI in case of Pakistan. In addition to, null hypothesis (i.e., LFDI does not granger cause LEG) and or accepted the alternative hypothesis (i.e., LFDI does granger cause LEG). Accepting the null hypothesis concludes that LFDI does not granger cause LEG.

5.7 Results Discussions:

The result of the study evidently demonstrates that level of FDI in the country largely affect the change in output level. The reason is that the change in FDI with respect to change in economic growth is significant in short-run and long-run. Therefore, it implies

that the FDI are essential for economic growth of Pakistan economy both in the long-run and short-run.

Also, Pair-wise granger causality test have been conducted which proposes that change in economic growth may contribute to magnetize more FDI in Pakistan. It means that higher the rate in economic growth, the higher will be the level of FDI in Pakistan. It is well documented in economic literature that foreign investors are devoted to invest in those countries where the growth rate is showing rising trend. A high level of economic growth is strong indication of market opportunities. Economic growth of the host country is considered to be the key factor for expansion in FDI. Thus an important conclusion of our estimation is that inflow of economic growth determines the FDI in the country. The results of our research corroborate with the findings of the Dritsaki, et al. (2004) and give new insights into the factors linked with FDI**.**

The positive relationships exist between economic growth and lnTO under concerned study. However, the estimate indicates that there is weak evidence for existence of the long-run relationship between economic growth and trade openness. As we know that FDI is the key source of new technology liberalization of international trade and investment, therefore it has positive impact on economic growth. FDI result in somehow increase the trade rising the variety and quality of intermediate inputs, increasing the diffusion of knowledge and increasing the market size. Making use of innovative technology by the recipient country is its only benefit. Since the trade openness is low in long-run for Pakistan, policy efforts should be geared towards reducing restriction on trade. This may be in the form of reducing tariffs, tax concession to foreign firms and sound favorable policies that encourage industrial production in the host country.

Total debt (TD) variable and economic growth are inversely related. This negative relationship is driven by burden in servicing the debt collected. As a result public and private investment jointly decline due to high cost of borrowing. Eventually economic growth will decline. Another reason may be the debt which has been paid in foreign

currency and worth of Pakistani rupees is weak as compared to foreign creditor's currency. Matching debt with projects, low interest loans with long-term repayment period, debts must be for capital expenditure and ensuring that debts generate the required profits to repay or service the loan collected are critical if the benefits from debts must to be realized.

The positive relationship between Inflation (INF) and economic growth suggests that a minimum threshold of inflation is important to boost up the small economy which is experiencing economic growth. Prices generally signal the investment community that there could be some positive return on investment ceteris paribus. Similarly, our result suggests the existence of "Tobin portfolio-shift effect" in Pakistan. High inflation leads to investor to invest in physical capital and cut their real balance holdings. However, for optimal and overall productivity and welfare, policy efforts are indeed need to decrease the inflation especially in the long-run economic growth.

Domestic Saving (DS) through investment process plays a vital role in economic growth and development of the country. Therefore, the results imply that more capable constructive policy should be put in place to promote domestic saving- investment in Pakistan.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section deals with the summary of the major findings and conclusion, while a second section discuss policy recommendations. Third section of this chapter suggests areas for further studies.

6.2 Summary of the major findings & Conclusion

The study was designed and conducted to analyze the relationship between Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Trade Openness (TO), Total Debt (TD), Inflation (INF), Domestic Saving (DS), Gross Capital Formation (GCF) and economic growth in Pakistan. As research used time series data for estimation, therefore, it is required to check the stationarity of the data. As the literature suggests different technique for the checking of stationarity. This study uses (ADF) and (PP) test to check the unit root in the data. Unit root test in the form of ADF and PP test is given in chapter no-5 which shows that that how many variables are integrated by zero order or by any other order. To achieve the objective of the study two dynamic econometric models, ARDL and pair-wise granger causality were specified based on theoretical and empirical linkages from the well document economic literature.

The main result of our research is that FDI is a major determinant of economic growth in Pakistan. This is evident by its significant positive coefficient on economic growth.

The insight from this research is important for deeper understanding of the role of FDI in economic growth process. In particular, this will serve as a relevant document to policy-makers and add stock researcher materials in this field. An in-depth treatment of the concluded resulted is necessary igniting fresh ideas towards attracting FDI and its effectiveness for the achievement of developmental goals. Though, this research has

successfully made these contributions, it however leaves open possibilities to do further analysis on results and observations made as part of this study.

6.3 Policy Recommendations

The outcomes of the study have significant policy implication to relevant economic agents. Government has a fundamental function to further improve the contribution and importance of FDI to economic growth. Given that the government has the key role of creating employment and overall welfare, promoting free inflow of foreign capital to Pakistan will significantly assist in achieving this objective. This will be more beneficial if FDI is directed towards sectors that improve welfare of the masses such as agriculture, health and education. Government policy in the scenario should be encouraging joint adventures in order to give opportunities to the domestic producer become one of the parts and enjoy the profit together with foreign investors. This will benefit to local partner as they are expose to high technology. Besides, ensuring that political stability is maintained and sustained is relevant for attracting foreign capital. Fight against corruption is central in giving good perception to foreign investors. Efficient monetary management is also crucial for maintain economic stability. An optimal inflation threshold consistent with growth needs to be carefully maintained. Given that overvalued exchange rate is at variance with export, determininog the best rate that encourages export is required by the monetary authorities.

6.4 Suggestion:

1- The present study can be further extended by analyzing the effect of FDI-led economic growth on income distribution and poverty reduction in Pakistan.

2- Second, future work should address how the effect of FDI on growth of Pakistan economy varies by industrial structure, the policy regime and the development of infrastructure.

REFERENCES

.

Abbas, Q., Akbar, S., Nasir, A., Amanullah, H. & Naseem, M. (2011) Impact of Foreign Direct Investment. Global Journal of Management and Business Research, c.11 S. 8 Version

Adam, A. & Tweneboah, G. (2009) Foreign Direct Investment and Stock Market Developments. International Research Journal of Economics S., 26.

Adekunle K.A and A.K Aderemi (2012). "Domestic Investment, Capital Formation and Population Growth in Nigeria"; Developing Country Studies; c.2, s. 7, 2012.

Adelowokan O.A and A.O Maku (2013) "Openness, Foreign Investment and Economic Growth in Nigeria: A Long-run Analysis". European Journal of Globalization and Development Research, C.7.s. 1

Agarwal, Jamuna P. (1980). "Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment: A Survey, "Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, C. 116, Heft 4.

Agrawal, P. (2000). Economic Impact of Foreign Direct Investment in South Asia, Indra Gandhi Institute of Development Research.

Ahmad, M.H., Alam, S. And Butt, M.S. (2003) Foreign Direct Investment, Exports, and Domestic Output in Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review, C. 42, No.4, pp. 715-723.

Aitken, B. and Harrison, A.E. (1999), "Do domestic firms benefit from direct foreign investment? Evidence from Venezuela", American Economic Review, C. 89, pp. 605-18.

Alfaro, L. and Rodriguez-Clare, A. (2004). "Multinationals and Linkages: Evidence from Latin America". Economia 4, pp.113-170.

Amjad and Khan (2004), External Determinants of Growth and Growth Projections: SAARC and Pakistan, The Pakistan Development Review, 43(4), 737-755.

Ang, J.B. (2008), "Financial development and the FDI-growth nexus: the Malaysian experience", Journal of Applied Economics, C. 41, pp. 1595-601.

Ang, J.B. (2009), "Foreign direct investment and its impact on the Thai economy: the role of financial development", Journal of Economics and Finance, C. 33, pp. 316-23.

Arshad, M. (2012). Impact of foreign direct investment on trade and economic growth of Pakistan: A co-integration analysis. Int. J. Eco. Res., 3(4), 42–75.

Aslam, N. (1987). "The Impact of Foreign Capital Inflow on Savings and Investment: The Case of Pakistan". Pakistan Development Review. Islamabad: Pakistan Institute of Development Economics. 26 (4), 787-89.

Atique, Z., Ahmad, H. M., & Azhar, U. (2004). The impact of FDI on economic growth under foreign trade regimes: A case study of Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review, 43(4), 707–718.

Aurangzeb, & Haq, A. U. (2012). Impact of foreign capital inflows on economic growth in Pakistan. European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 46, 6.

Bakare A.S (2011); "A Theoretical Analysis of Capital Formation and Growth in Nigeria" Far East Journal of Psychology and Business c.3 s. 1 April 2011.

Balasubramanyam VN. Salisu M. Sapsford D. 1992. Foreign direct investment and growth: new hypothesis and evidence. Economic Journal 106: 92-105.

Barro, R. J. (1995) Inflation and Economic Growth. NBER Working Paper 5326.

Barro, R. J. and Martin, S. (1995) Economic Growth. McGraw Hill: New York.

Beddies (2010); "Investment, Capital Accumulation and Growth: Some Evidence from Gambia: 1964-1998"; IMF Working Paper 99/117, August.

Bhagwati JN. (1978). Anatomy and Consequences of Exchange Control Regimes, c. 1,

Studies in International Economic Relations No. 10 NBER: New York.

Blomström, M. (1986), ―Foreign Direct Investment and Productive Efficiency: the case of Mexico‖, Journal of Industrial Economics, 15: 97 – 110

Bruno, M. and W. Easterly. (1995). Inflation crises and long-run growth. Journal of Monetary Economics, c. 41.

Brown, R.L., Durbin, J. and Evans, J.M. (1975), "Techniques for testing the constancy of regression relationship over time", Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, C. 37, pp. 149-63.

Chaudhry; Ali Malik & Muhammad Zahir Faridi. "Exploring the causality relationship between trade liberalization, human capital and economic growth:." Journal of Economics and International Finance, 2010: C. 2(8), pp. 175-182.

Chenery, H.B. and A.M. Strout (1966). "Foreign Assistance and Economic Development". American Economic Review. New York: American Economic Association. 56 (4), 179-773.

Choe, J. II (2003), "Do foreign direct investment and gross domestic investment promote economic growth?", Review of Development Economics, C. 7 No. 1, pp. 44-57.

Choong, C.-K. and Lim, K.-P. (2009), "Foreign direct investment, financial development and economic growth: the case of Malaysia", Macro-economics and Finance in Emerging Market Economies, C. 2, pp. 13-30

Chowdhury, A. and Mavrotas, G. (2006), "FDI and growth? What causes what?", The World Economy, C. 29, pp. 9-19.

Christoffersen, P. and Doyle, P. (1998). From Inflation to Growth, Eight Years of Transition. IMF Working Paper.

Engle, R.F. and Granger, C.W.J. (1987), "Co-integration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing", Econometrica, C. 55, pp. 251-76.

Falki, N. (2009). Impact of foreign direct investment on economic growth in Pakistan. International Review of Business Research Papers, 5(5), 110–120.

Fry, Maxwell J. (1993) 'Foreign Direct Investment Macroeconomic Framework: Finance Efficiency, Incentives and Distortions', PRE Working Paper, Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Ghosh, A. and S, Phillips. (1998). Warning: Inflation may be harmful to your Growth. IMF working Papers C. 45, s.4

Gonzalez, J.G. (1988), Effect of Foreign Direct Investment in the presence of sector specific unemployment", International Economic Journal 2(2): 150-27.

Granger C. W. J. Investigating Casual Relationship by Econometric Models and Cross Spectral Methods [J]. Econometrica, 1969,(37):424-458.

Griffin, K.B. (1970). "Foreign Capital, Domestic Savings and Development". Bulletin of Oxford University. Institute of Economics and Statistics. Oxford University Press. 32 (2).

Guisinger, Stephen, "The effects of foreign Direct Investment Liberalization on Pakistan", Pakistan Development Review, 36, winter 1997, Pp. 403-418.

Hermes, N., & Lensink, R. (2003). Foreign direct investment, financial development and economic growth. The Journal of Development Studies, 40(1), 142–163.

Jhinghan M. L. (2006) Advanced Economic Theory (Micro and Macro) 12th Edition New Delhi. Vrinda Publications.

Johansen, S. and K. Juselius (1990) Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference on Cointegration—With Application to the Demand for Money. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics 52, 169–210.

Khan, M. S. and Senhadji, A. (2001) Threshold Effects in the Relationship between

Inflation and Growth, IMF Staff Papers, 48:1

Khan, R.S (2007)," Has Aid helped Pakistan", The Pakistan Development Review c: 36:4 Part II, pp.947-957.

Kindleberger, C. P. (1984) Multinational Excursions. Cambridge: MIT Press. King, R. G., and R. Levine (1993) Finance and Growth: Schumpeter Might be Right. Quarterly Journal of Economics 108, 717–737.

Kokko, A. (1996), "Productivity Spillovers from Competition between Local Firms and Foreign Affiliates", Journal of International Development, C. 8, pp. 517-530.

Kundan, M. (2010), "A time series analysis of foreign direct investment and economic growth: a case study of Nepal", International Journal of Business and Management, C. 5 No. 2, pp. 144-8.

Leff, N.H. (1969). "Dependency Rates and Saving Rates". American Economic Review. New York: American Economic Association. 59 (5).

Li, X. and Xiaming, L. (2005), "Foreign direct investment and economic growth: an increasingly endogenous relationship", Journal of World Development, C. 3, pp. 393-407.

Lim D. 1983. Fiscal incentives and direct foreign investment in less developed countries. Journal of Development Studies 19: 207-212.

Louzi, B. M., & Abadi, A. (2001). The impact of foreign direct investment on economic growth in Jordan, IJRRAS, 8(2), 253–258.

Macdougal, G. D. A., (1960), ' The Benefits and Costs of Private Investment from Abroad: A Theoretical Approach," Economic Record 36 (Mar. 1960), 13-35.

Mah, J. S. (1965). Foreign direct investment inflows and economic growth of China, Journal of Policy Modeling, 32, 155-158.

Malik, G. and Chowdhury, A. (2001). Inflation and Economic Growth: Evidence from

South Asian Countries. Asian Pacific Development Journal, C. 8, s.1

Malik. (1996). Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth in Pakistan. Pakistan Economy, 42(6), 7–26.

Mallik, Girijasankar and Anis Chowdhury (2001). Inflation and Economic Growth: Evidence from four South Asian Countries, Asia-Pacific Development Journal, C. 8, s.1. pp. 123-135.

Mencinger, J. (2003), "Does foreign direct investment always enhance economic growth?",

Meyer, K. 1988a. Direct investment in economies in transition. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Modigliani, F. (1970): "The Life Cycle Hypothesis of Saving and Inter-Country Differences in the Saving Ratio," in Induction, Growth, and Trade: Essays in Honor of Sir Roy Harrod, ed. by W. A. Eltis. Clarendon Press, London.

Motley. (1994). Growth and inflation: a cross-country study.

Mubarik, Y (2005) Inflation and Growth: An Estimate of the Threshold Level of Inflation in Pakistan. State Bank of Pakistan Research Bulletin, C. 1(1)

Mum, H.W., Lin, T.K. and Man, Y.K. (2008), "FDI and economic growth relationship: an empirical study on Malaysia", International Business Research, C. 1 s.2, pp. 18-29

Munir, Q., Mansoor,Q. & Furuoka, F. (2009) Inflation and Economic Growth in Malaysia: A Threshold Regression Approach, ASEAN Economic Bulletin, 26(2),180-193.

Nair-Reichert, U. and Weinhold, D. (2001), ―Causality tests for cross-country panels: a new look on FDI and economic growth in developing countries‖, Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 63: 153 – 171.

Nasir S. M and Hyder K.S (2005) “Economic of Pakistan” Newfine Printing Press Lahoer.Pp 46.

Omran, M. and Bolbol, A. (2003), “Foreign direct investment, financial development and economic growth: evidence from the Arab countries”, Review of Middle East Economics and Finance, C. 3, pp. 231-49.

Orji Anthony and Mba, Peter.N (2011) “Foreign Private Investment, Capital Formation and Economic Growth in Nigeria: a two stage least square approach” Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development.

Pesaran, M.H., Shin, Y. and Smith, R.J. 2001. “Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of level relationship.” Journal of Applied Economics 16: 289-326.

Pournarakis, M. and Axarloglou, K. (2007), “Do all foreign direct investment inflows benefit the local economy?”, The World Economy, C. 30, pp. 424-45.

Santiago, C.E (1987), "The impact of foreign direct investment on export structure and employment generation" World Development, 15(3): 317-328.

Saqib, N., Masnoon, M., & Rafique, N. (2013). Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on Economic Growth of Pakistan. Advances in Management & Applied Economics, 3(1), 35–45.

Shabbir H. Kazmi (1998), “Declining Foreign Investment In Pakistan”, website:

Shabbir, T., and A. Mahmood (1992) The Effect of Foreign Private Investment on Economic Growth in Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review 31:4, 83 1–841.

Shabbir, T., and H. Kazmi (1988) The Effect of Foreign Private Investment on Economic Growth in Pakistan. The Pakistan Development Review 31:4, 83 1–841.

Shahbaz, M. and Rahman, M.M. (2010), “Foreign capital inflows-growth nexus and role of domestic financial sector: an ARDL co-integration approach for Pakistan”,

Journal of Economic Research, C. 15, pp. 207-31

Sidrauski, M. (1967). Rational Choice and Patterns of Growth in a Monetary Economy. American Economic Review 57(2), pp 534-544.

Singh, T. (2009) "Does domestic saving cause economic growth? A time-series evidence from India," Journal of Policy Modeling, doi:10.1016/j.jpolmod.2009.08.008,

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

Srinivasan, P. (1983) "Stock Market Development and Capital Accumulation in Less Developed Countries" Mimeograph Jadavpur University, Kolkata India

Stephen P.Ferris, G. Rooney Thompson, and Calvin Valson (1997). "An analysis of FDI in Latin America ". Pakistan Economics and Social Review, c: xxxv, s.1(summer 1997), pp. 11- 24.

Stoneman, J. (1975) .Money and Economic Growth. Econometrica, C. 33, pp. 671-684.

Soboleva, Nadezhada (1999). "Foreign Direct Investment and trade policy: An Empirical Analysis ". Yale University, 1999.

Sung-Hoon Lim (internet - down loaded), "Foreign Direct Investment Policy and Incentives". Senior Researcher/ Ph.D. Korea Trade-Investment Promotion Agency (KOTRA).

Tang, C.F. and H.H. Lean, 2013. The role of savings on economic growth in Malaysia: A view from generalized variance decomposition analysis. Economic Computation and Economic Cybernetics Studies and Research, 47(3): 199-214.

UNCTAD (2000) World Investment Report: Trends and Determinants York and Geneva: United Nations.

UNCTAD (2004) World Investment Report: Promoting Linkages. New York: United Nations

UNCTAD (2006) World Investment Report 2006. Geneva.

Wang Zhiyong. (2008). Chinese Economic Growth and Inflation. Chinese society science Institute Press.

Wang, M. and Wong, M.C.S. (2009), "What drives economic growth? The case of cross-border M & A and greenfield FDI activities", KYKLOS, C. 62 s.2, pp. 316-30.

Yousuf, M. M., Hussain, Z., & Ahmad, N. (2008). Economic evaluation of foreign direct investment in Pakistan. Pakistan Economic and Social Review, 46(1), 37–56.

Zhang, K.H. (2001), "Does foreign direct investment promote economic growth? Evidence from East Asia and Latin America", Journal of Contemporary Economic Policy, C. 19 No. 2, pp. 175-85.

Zhang, K.H. (2004), "How does foreign direct investment affect economic growth in China?", Journal of Economics of Transition, C. 9 s.3, pp. 679-93.

APPENDEXIX

APPENDIX I: ARDL MODEL

Dependent Variable: LGDP
Method: ARDL
Date: 03/27/16 Time: 19:13
Sample (adjusted): 1977 2013
Included observations: 37 after adjustments
Maximum dependent lags: 2 (Automatic selection)
Model selection method: Akaike info criterion (AIC)
Dynamic regressors (2 lags, automatic): LGDS LGFCF LINF LTDS LTP LFDI
Fixed regressors: DUM DUM2 C
Number of models evalulated: 1458
Selected Model: ARDL(1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 0)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.*
LGDP(-1)	0.855339	0.056193	15.22140	0.0000
LGDS	0.067903	0.015351	4.423441	0.0003
LGDS(-1)	-0.051457	0.012897	-3.989717	0.0008
LGFCF	0.048263	0.050174	0.961898	0.3482
LGFCF(-1)	-0.371889	0.080015	-4.647729	0.0002
LGFCF(-2)	0.105993	0.059583	1.778903	0.0913
LINF	-0.020504	0.246613	-0.083142	0.9346
LINF(-1)	-0.070830	0.386482	-0.183267	0.8565
LINF(-2)	0.354217	0.217908	1.625538	0.1205
LTDS	0.015572	0.009566	1.627940	0.1200
LTDS(-1)	-0.038206	0.013397	-2.851797	0.0102
LTP	0.028133	0.035041	0.802867	0.4320
LTP(-1)	0.071120	0.036858	1.929574	0.0687
LTP(-2)	-0.042932	0.036397	-1.179549	0.2527
LFDI	0.026289	0.007442	3.532345	0.0022
DUM	0.049978	0.012566	3.977374	0.0008
DUM2	0.034673	0.014078	2.462946	0.0235
C	6.729032	1.245226	5.403866	0.0000

R-squared	0.999756	Mean dependent var	24.94387
Adjusted R-squared	0.999538	S.D. dependent var	0.505050
S.E. of regression	0.010852	Akaike info criterion	-5.902481
Sum squared resid	0.002237	Schwarz criterion	-5.118792
Log likelihood	127.1959	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-5.626194
F-statistic	4585.788	Durbin-Watson stat	2.457644
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

*Note: p-values and any subsequent tests do not account for model selection.

APPENDIX II: BOUND TEST TO COINTEGRATION

ARDL Bounds Test
Date: 03/27/16 Time: 19:06
Sample: 1975 2013
Included observations: 37
Null Hypothesis: No long-run relationships exist

Test Statistic	Value	k
F-statistic	8.143978	6

Critical Value Bounds

Significance	I0 Bound	I1 Bound
10%	1.99	2.94
5%	2.27	3.28
2.5%	2.55	3.61
1%	2.88	3.99

Test Equation:
Dependent Variable: D(LGDP)
Method: Least Squares
Date: 07/27/15 Time: 19:06
Sample: 1977 2013
Included observations: 37

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
D(LGDS)	0.057420	0.019554	2.936503	0.0085
D(LGFCF)	0.105494	0.063552	1.659954	0.1133
D(LGFCF(-1))	-0.006411	0.068838	-0.093132	0.9268
D(LINF)	0.369887	0.285479	1.295675	0.2106
D(LINF(-1))	-0.384119	0.297749	-1.290077	0.2125
D(LTDS)	0.006805	0.012747	0.533885	0.5996
D(LTP)	0.037910	0.046032	0.823551	0.4204
D(LTP(-1))	-0.019780	0.043942	-0.450143	0.6577
DUM	0.049761	0.016175	3.076500	0.0062
DUM2	0.045029	0.017760	2.535443	0.0202
C	4.254625	1.592912	2.670974	0.0151
LGDS(-1)	0.019715	0.014564	1.353710	0.1917
LGFCF(-1)	-0.152971	0.080620	-1.897426	0.0731
LINF(-1)	0.275482	0.086934	3.168870	0.0051
LTDS(-1)	-0.014970	0.017401	-0.860304	0.4003
LTP(-1)	0.136091	0.058178	2.339212	0.0304
LFDI(-1)	0.000761	0.009714	0.078369	0.9384
LGDP(-1)	-0.101045	0.072060	-1.402243	0.1770

R-squared	0.764561	Mean dependent var	0.047630
Adjusted R-squ...	0.553905	S.D. dependent var	0.020909
S.E. of regression	0.013965	Akaike info criterion	-5.397972
Sum squared re...	0.003706	Schwarz criterion	-4.614282
Log likelihood	117.8625	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-5.121684
F-statistic	3.629429	Durbin-Watson stat	2.343497
Prob(F-statistic)	0.004071		

APPENDIX III: ARDL COINTEGRATING & LONG RUN FORM

ARDL Cointegrating And Long Run Form
Dependent Variable: LGDP
Selected Model: ARDL(1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 0)
Date: 03/27/16 Time: 19:06
Sample: 1975 2013
Included observations: 37

Cointegrating Form

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
D(LGDS)	0.067903	0.015351	4.423441	0.0003
D(LGFCF)	0.048263	0.050174	0.961898	0.3482
D(LGFCF(-1))	-0.105993	0.059583	-1.778903	0.0913
D(LINF)	-0.020504	0.246613	-0.083142	0.9346
D(LINF(-1))	-0.354217	0.217908	-1.625538	0.1205
D(LTDS)	0.015572	0.009566	1.627940	0.1200
D(LTP)	0.028133	0.035041	0.802867	0.4320
D(LTP(-1))	0.042932	0.036397	1.179549	0.2527
D(LFDI)	0.026289	0.007442	3.532345	0.0022
D(DUM)	0.049978	0.012566	3.977374	0.0008
D(DUM2)	0.034673	0.014078	2.462946	0.0235
CointEq(-1)	-0.144661	0.056193	-2.574359	0.0186

Cointeq = LGDP - (0.1137*LGDS -1.5044*LGFCF + 1.8172*LINF -0.1565 *LTDS + 0.3893*LTP + 0.1817*LFDI + 0.3455*DUM + 0.2397*DUM2 + 46.5157)

Long Run Coefficients

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
LGDS	0.113687	0.077279	1.471117	0.1576
LGFCF	1.504438	0.738197	-2.037991	0.0557
LINF	1.817235	0.463456	3.921054	0.0009
LTDS	-0.156460	0.059871	-2.613299	0.0171
LTP	0.389332	0.399145	0.975415	0.3416
LFDI	0.181730	0.077942	2.331622	0.0309
DUM	0.345482	0.159359	2.167946	0.0431
DUM2	0.239682	0.127844	1.874809	0.0763
C	46.515748	13.346173	3.485325	0.0025

APPENDIX IV: CORRELOGRAM OF RESIDUALS

Sample: 1975 2013
Included observations: 37
Q-statistic probabilities adjusted for 1 dynamic regressor

Autocorrelation	Partial Correlation		AC	PAC	Q-Stat	Prob*
		1	-0.234	-0.234	2.1939	0.139
		2	-0.151	-0.217	3.1305	0.209
		3	-0.070	-0.182	3.3388	0.342
		4	0.182	0.087	4.7801	0.311
		5	0.014	0.057	4.7885	0.442
		6	-0.170	-0.120	6.1390	0.408
		7	0.017	-0.028	6.1533	0.522
		8	0.033	-0.042	6.2064	0.624
		9	0.168	0.151	7.6632	0.568
		10	-0.324	-0.235	13.276	0.209
		11	-0.154	-0.306	14.596	0.202
		12	0.161	-0.072	16.083	0.187
		13	-0.007	-0.178	16.086	0.245
		14	-0.143	-0.219	17.372	0.237
		15	0.178	0.214	19.444	0.194
		16	-0.013	-0.054	19.456	0.246
		17	0.011	-0.024	19.465	0.302
		18	-0.163	-0.175	21.493	0.255
		19	0.116	0.008	22.568	0.257
		20	-0.028	-0.159	22.636	0.307
		21	0.141	-0.037	24.435	0.272
		22	-0.034	0.001	24.545	0.319
		23	-0.037	-0.035	24.686	0.367
		24	0.088	-0.146	25.549	0.376
		25	-0.119	-0.079	27.241	0.344
		26	0.069	0.080	27.866	0.365
		27	-0.078	-0.114	28.748	0.373
		28	0.106	-0.070	30.540	0.338
		29	-0.065	-0.020	31.296	0.352
		30	0.025	-0.133	31.425	0.395
		31	-0.009	-0.083	31.443	0.444
		32	-0.012	0.032	31.482	0.493
		33	-0.000	0.041	31.482	0.543
		34	0.001	-0.048	31.482	0.592
		35	-0.002	-0.074	31.484	0.639

*Probabilities may not be valid for this equation specification.

APPENDIX V: CORRELOGRAM OF RESIDUALS SQUARED

Date: 03/27/16 Time: 19:07
Sample: 1975 2013
Included observations: 37

Autocorrelation	Partial Correlation		AC	PAC	Q-Stat	Prob*
		1	0.083	0.083	0.2764	0.599
		2	0.142	0.136	1.1126	0.573
		3	-0.088	-0.113	1.4433	0.695
		4	-0.097	-0.105	1.8586	0.762
		5	-0.174	-0.135	3.2203	0.666
		6	-0.152	-0.118	4.2974	0.636
		7	-0.033	0.010	4.3510	0.739
		8	-0.077	-0.080	4.6475	0.795
		9	0.219	0.195	7.1135	0.625
		10	0.353	0.345	13.791	0.183
		11	-0.154	-0.361	15.107	0.178
		12	0.097	0.049	15.652	0.208
		13	-0.107	0.037	16.339	0.231
		14	-0.078	-0.115	16.721	0.271
		15	-0.240	-0.117	20.515	0.153
		16	-0.169	-0.155	22.481	0.128
		17	-0.192	-0.163	25.135	0.092
		18	-0.095	-0.032	25.813	0.104
		19	0.170	-0.054	28.128	0.081
		20	0.030	-0.077	28.202	0.105
		21	-0.007	0.024	28.207	0.134
		22	0.008	-0.232	28.212	0.169
		23	-0.028	-0.023	28.291	0.205
		24	-0.048	0.042	28.543	0.238
		25	-0.050	0.031	28.845	0.270
		26	0.000	0.079	28.845	0.318
		27	0.016	0.114	28.883	0.367
		28	0.070	-0.078	29.658	0.380
		29	0.025	-0.135	29.771	0.426
		30	-0.023	-0.017	29.881	0.472
		31	0.006	-0.033	29.890	0.523
		32	0.027	0.023	30.101	0.563
		33	0.015	-0.111	30.183	0.608
		34	0.016	-0.063	30.303	0.650
		35	0.025	-0.022	30.763	0.673

*Probabilities may not be valid for this equation specification.

APPENDIX VI: BREUSCH-GODFREY SERIAL CORRELATION LM TEST

Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test:

F-statistic	1.558160	Prob. F(2,17)	0.2391
Obs*R-squared	5.731855	Prob. Chi-Square(2)	0.0569

Test Equation:
Dependent Variable: RESID
Method: ARDL
Date: 03/27/16 Time: 19:07
Sample: 1977 2013
Included observations: 37
Presample missing value lagged residuals set to zero.

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
LGDP(-1)	0.037115	0.058541	0.634005	0.5345
LGDS	-0.010248	0.016275	-0.629650	0.5373
LGDS(-1)	0.000888	0.013012	0.068231	0.9464
LGFCF	0.026159	0.050999	0.512933	0.6146
LGFCF(-1)	-0.007685	0.078030	-0.098482	0.9227
LGFCF(-2)	-0.001238	0.058246	-0.021249	0.9833
LINF	-0.103882	0.252143	-0.411994	0.6855
LINF(-1)	0.202099	0.400497	0.504619	0.6203
LINF(-2)	-0.150183	0.230534	-0.651457	0.5235
LTDS	0.002221	0.009411	0.235982	0.8163
LTDS(-1)	0.008344	0.013875	0.601380	0.5555
LTP	0.005698	0.034482	0.165259	0.8707
LTP(-1)	0.001495	0.035857	0.041693	0.9672
LTP(-2)	-0.008401	0.036082	-0.232825	0.8187
LFDI	-0.001089	0.007298	-0.149250	0.8831
DUM	-0.004095	0.012438	-0.329233	0.7460
DUM2	0.001910	0.013726	0.139144	0.8910
C	-1.038836	1.345793	-0.771914	0.4508
RESID(-1)	-0.431328	0.272152	-1.584883	0.1314
RESID(-2)	-0.358308	0.275337	-1.301345	0.2105

R-squared	0.154915	Mean dependent var	-1.66E-15
Adjusted R-squared	-0.789592	S.D. dependent var	0.007884
S.E. of regression	0.010546	Akaike info criterion	-5.962691
Sum squared resid	0.001891	Schwarz criterion	-5.091925
Log likelihood	130.3098	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-5.655705
F-statistic	0.164017	Durbin-Watson stat	2.008402
Prob(F-statistic)	0.999853		

APPENDIX VII: HETEROSCEDASTICITY TEST BREUSCH-PAGAN-GODFREY

Heteroskedasticity Test: Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey			
F-statistic	1.196821	Prob. F(17,19)	0.3503
Obs*R-squared	19.13285	Prob. Chi-Square(17)	0.3210
Scaled explained SS	4.229634	Prob. Chi-Square(17)	0.9992

Test Equation:
Dependent Variable: RESID^2
Method: Least Squares
Date: 03/27/16 Time: 19:08
Sample: 1977 2013
Included observations: 37

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.006609	0.008713	0.758519	0.4574
LGDP(-1)	-0.000407	0.000393	-1.034730	0.3138
LGDS	4.89E-06	0.000107	0.045531	0.9642
LGDS(-1)	0.000124	9.02E-05	1.374226	0.1854
LGFCF	-0.000192	0.000351	-0.546614	0.5910
LGFCF(-1)	-0.000194	0.000560	-0.346130	0.7330
LGFCF(-2)	0.000468	0.000417	1.122730	0.2755
LINF	-0.003135	0.001726	-1.816528	0.0851
LINF(-1)	0.006316	0.002704	2.335355	0.0306
LINF(-2)	-0.002920	0.001525	-1.914829	0.0707
LTDS	5.50E-05	6.69E-05	0.821979	0.4213
LTDS(-1)	-0.000109	9.37E-05	-1.158815	0.2609
LTP	0.000388	0.000245	1.581866	0.1302
LTP(-1)	-0.000217	0.000258	-0.842523	0.4100
LTP(-2)	-0.000252	0.000255	-0.991291	0.3340
LFDI	2.27E-05	5.21E-05	0.436384	0.6675
DUM	-1.61E-05	8.79E-05	-0.183354	0.8565
DUM2	-3.95E-05	9.85E-05	-0.400634	0.6932

R-squared	0.517104	Mean dependent var	6.05E-05
Adjusted R-squared	0.085039	S.D. dependent var	7.94E-05
S.E. of regression	7.59E-05	Akaike info criterion	-15.82695
Sum squared resid	1.10E-07	Schwarz criterion	-15.04326
Log likelihood	310.7986	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-15.55067
F-statistic	1.196821	Durbin-Watson stat	2.691291
Prob(F-statistic)	0.350312		

APPENDIX VIII: HETEROSCEDASTICITY TEST ARCH

Heteroskedasticity Test: ARCH				
F-statistic	0.239809	Prob. F(1,34)		0.6275
Obs*R-squared	0.252137	Prob. Chi-Square(1)		0.6156

Test Equation:
Dependent Variable: RESID^2
Method: Least Squares
Date: 07/27/15 Time: 19:08
Sample (adjusted): 1978 2013
Included observations: 36 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	5.69E-05	1.71E-05	3.331351	0.0021
RESID^2(-1)	0.083419	0.170346	0.489703	0.6275

R-squared	0.007004	Mean dependent var	6.20E-05
Adjusted R-squared	-0.022202	S.D. dependent var	7.99E-05
S.E. of regression	8.08E-05	Akaike info criterion	-15.95490
Sum squared resid	2.22E-07	Schwarz criterion	-15.86692
Log likelihood	289.1881	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-15.92419
F-statistic	0.239809	Durbin-Watson stat	2.031418
Prob(F-statistic)	0.627489		

APPENDIX IX: RAMSEY RESET TEST

Equation: UNTITLED
Specification: LGDP LGDP(-1) LGDS LGDS(-1) LGFCF LGFCF(-1) LGFCF(-2) LINF LINF(-1) LINF(-2) LTDS LTDS(-1) LTP LTP(-1) LTP(-2) LFDI DUM DUM2 C
Omitted Variables: Squares of fitted values

	Value	df	Probability
t-statistic	0.478350	18	0.6382
F-statistic	0.228819	(1, 18)	0.6382

F-test summary:

	Sum of Sq.	df	Mean Squares
Test SSR	2.81E-05	1	2.81E-05
Restricted SSR	0.002237	19	0.000118
Unrestricted SSR	0.002209	18	0.000123

Unrestricted Test Equation:
Dependent Variable: LGDP
Method: ARDL
Date: 03/27/16 Time: 19:09
Sample: 1975 2013
Included observations: 37
Maximum dependent lags: 2 (Automatic selection)
Model selection method: Akaike info criterion (AIC)
Dynamic regressors (2 lags, automatic):
Fixed regressors: C

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.*
LGDP(-1)	-0.217545	2.243618	-0.096962	0.9238
LGDS	-0.012253	0.168299	-0.072803	0.9428
LGDS(-1)	0.010930	0.131085	0.083384	0.9345
LGFCF	0.010823	0.093541	0.115702	0.9092
LGFCF(-1)	0.075206	0.938224	0.080158	0.9370
LGFCF(-2)	-0.014017	0.258152	-0.054299	0.9573
LINF	0.057200	0.299631	0.190903	0.8507
LINF(-1)	-0.006719	0.416713	-0.016124	0.9873
LINF(-2)	-0.051466	0.876782	-0.058699	0.9538
LTDS	-0.001499	0.036999	-0.040502	0.9681
LTDS(-1)	0.010232	0.102181	0.100137	0.9213
LTP	-0.014782	0.096585	-0.153048	0.8801
LTP(-1)	-0.015943	0.185856	-0.085782	0.9326
LTP(-2)	0.001375	0.099801	0.013782	0.9892
LFDI	-0.004589	0.064998	-0.070608	0.9445
DUM	-0.008130	0.122152	-0.066559	0.9477
DUM2	-0.007429	0.089181	-0.083307	0.9345
C	14.02190	15.29880	0.916536	0.3715
FITTED^2	0.023844	0.049846	0.478350	0.6382

R-squared	0.999759	Mean dependent var	24.94387
Adjusted R-squared	0.999519	S.D. dependent var	0.505050
S.E. of regression	0.011079	Akaike info criterion	-5.861059
Sum squared resid	0.002209	Schwarz criterion	-5.033831
Log likelihood	127.4296	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-5.569423
F-statistic	4155.245	Durbin-Watson stat	2.414707
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

*Note: p-values and any subsequent tests do not account for model selection.

APPENDIX X: CUSUM



APPENDIX XI: CUSUM OF SQUARES



APPENDIX XI: PAIRWISE GRANGER CAUSALITY TESTS

Pairwise Granger Causality Tests
Date: 05/14/16 Time: 17:41
Sample: 1975 2013
Lags: 2

Null Hypothesis:	Obs	F-Statistic	Prob.
LGDP does not Granger Cause LFDI	37	5.77883	0.0072
LFDI does not Granger Cause LGDP		1.98705	0.1537