External Debts and Nigeria's Economic Development

Akujuobi, L. E (ACTI, MNIM)
Department of Financial Management Technology
Federal University of Technology
Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria
E-mail: leakujuobi@yahoo.com

Abstract

The impact of different types of external debt on economic development of Nigeria was studied using multiple regression technique. It was found that while London Club debts were negatively significant, only past values of gross domestic product (GDP), taken as independent variable, was found to be positively significant. It is therefore recommended that Nigeria should not only be careful in taking new loans but make sure that any one taken is channelled to productive uses.

Keywords: External debt, economic development, economic growth, crowding out, debt problem.

Introduction

Nigeria is a federation made up of Federal, state and local governments. All these tiers of government make efforts towards the economic development of the country, among other desired goals. According to Akujuobi and Kalu (2009), they do this by embarking on real asset investments which are financed with their increasingly reducing financial resources. This type of investment is expected, in line with economic development theories that advocate increased accumulation of capital and spending, to help achieve targeted levels of economic development (Todaro and Smith, 2006). The schools of thought associated with economic development include structuralism, the linear-stages-growth model and the neo-classical revival of the 1980s. It is the belief of the structuralists that governments should lead development, though this approach is linked with inefficiencies associated with government activities. The linear-stages-of-growth model which is the Western European view of economic development has the Rostow development model as a representative. According to Akujuobi (2006) the model is a stage-by-stage approach that needs savings and or borrowing for sustainable economic development to take place. On the other hand, according to Todaro and Smith (2006) the Neo-Classical model's central argument is that underdevelopment results from poor resource allocation due to incorrect pricing policies and too much state intervention by overly active developing-nation governments The Neoclassical revival group is private – market based and does not support government intervention. The adherents believe that the massive economic development that occurred in Latin America after the debt crisis of the early 1980s and that of the former socialist economies after the fall of the Soviet Union is traceable to this framework.

In line with these theories, particularly the stage-by-stage growth model, Nigeria borrowed extensively to fund the different sectors of the economy, as it experienced low capital formation but in a hurry to develop economically. In support of this, Soludo (2003) asserts that countries borrow for macroeconomic reasons such as higher investment, higher consumption in education and health or to finance transitory balance of payments deficits. However, he believes that higher debt levels lead to debt servicing burden which leaves the country on the wrong side of the debt-laffer curve, with debt crowding out investment and growth. No wonder King (2005) sees Nigeria as constantly under pressure, with never enough money for poverty reduction

and basic social services and has run a fiscal deficit of 5 – 10% of gross domestic product (GDP).

There is, therefore, the problem of borrowing heavily both internally and externally to fund the different sectors of Nigerian economy, with doubtful corresponding gains. Some studies have been done to examine the impact of debts on the economic development of Nigeria. Adopoju, Salau and Obayelu (2007) and Adegbite, Ayadi and Ayadi (2008) concentrated on the effect of external debt on the country's economic development and found it impacting negatively, especially after certain levels. On the other hand Akujuobi and Onuorah (2007) and Amakom (2003) looked at the debt problem by distinguishing between external and internal ones and advised against unrestrained use of external part of the debt overhang because of the negative impact. This present study goes further to investigate the external debt problem through the various types with a view to seeing which types are more beneficial.

The study is therefore based on the hypothesis that multilateral debt, Paris club debt, London club debt, promissory notes and others do not significantly impact on the economic development of Nigeria. To do that the paper is divided into the first section, which is the introduction, part II, literature review, part III research methodology, and lastly part IV which treats conclusion and recommendation.

Literature review

Developing countries have for a long time been groaning under the heavy burden of external debts. As a result of this, many applied for and obtained debt forgiveness while others engaged in other techniques capable of reducing the burden. This brought to the fore theories connecting external debt and economic development such as debt overhang theory. Krugman (1989) sees debt overhang as a situation in which the expected repayment on foreign debt falls short of the contractual value of the debt and showed that there is a limit at which accumulated debt stimulates investment and growth. Also, Borensztan (1990) asserts that debt overhang crisis is a situation in which the debtor country benefits very little from the returns on any additional investment because of the debt service obligation.

Clements, Bhattacharya and Nguyen (2005) while looking at how debt relief boosted growth in poor countries asserts that external debt beyond 20-25 percent of GDP in net present value terms contributes negatively to the

economy. Iyoha (1999) in his study of the impact of external debt on economic growth in sub-Saharan African countries found that in the region the external debt to GNP (EDT: GNP) ratio is so high that it creates debt overhang problems that consequently affect investment and growth negatively. This is so because if debt exceeds the countries repayment ability there is the probability of expected debts service increasing beyond the country's output level function. Consequent upon this, since part of the future return on any investment will accrue to the creditor as bigger debt service payments; it discourages capital accumulation and promotes capital flight (Elbadawi et. al. 1997; Koeda, 2006).

In addition, Elbadawi et. al. (1997) found that external debt affects economic growth through direct and indirect channels, showing negative impact after higher levels of debt in most cases. Moreover, capital flight through external indebtedness has three major consequences, according to Ajayi and Khan (2000). The first one being the fact that any amount of money set away to foreign countries through payment of external debts cannot contribute to domestic investment, thereby diverting domestic savings away from domestic real investment. Furthermore, income and wealth paid to external creditors abroad in form of external debt servicing are outside and cannot be taxed. This means that potential government revenue is reduced as well as the capacity of the government to further service its debts. In addition they posit that income distribution is negatively affected by capital flows, as the poor citizens are subjected to austerity measures in order to pay for external debt obligations. No wonder Iyoha (1999) in his own study of external debt and economic growth in sub-Saharan African found that mounting external debt depresses investment through both a disincentive effect and a crowding out effect. In their own assessment of the non-linear impact of external debt on growth, using a panel data of ninety three countries Pattillo, Rocci and Poirson (2002) found that there was a negative impact at the level of 160-170% of exports or 35 – 40% of GDP.

In his cross-country study, Hansen (2001) investigated the impact of aid and external debt on growth and investment and found a negative impact of debt and debt service on growth and investment. In line with this Oxfam (1998) saw that, among others, excessive debt servicing led to low economic growth while Were (2002) while studying Kenya found that Kenya's high debt overhang problem led to a negative impact on economic growth and private investment. In Nigerian case, Okonjo – Iwuala (2003) added another dimension to debt problem when she noted that while a great deal of attention

has been given to the size of debts and others, not much has been said about the institutional arrangements for proper management of the debt, which obviously can impact on how size of debt affects economic development.

Research methodology

Data collection

The data for the study was sourced from the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) Statistical Bulletin, covering the period 1969 – 2009.Here; the various sources of external debt were regressed on the actual gross domestic product (GDP) figures for the corresponding period.

The F-test was used to test the overall significance of the explanatory variables taken together, while the student t-test was used to test for the significance of each explanatory variable or components of external debt contribution to the level of economic development in Nigeria. The coefficient of multiple determination (R^2) was used to test for goodness of fit of the study.

Table 1: Nigerian Data Set on External Debt Components and GDP, 1969-2009

S/N	YEAR	MULTILAT	PARCLUB	LONCLUB	PROMNOTE	OTHERS	TOTAL	GDP
1	1969	36.2	139.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	175.8	3549.3
2	1970	37.9	136.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	175.0	5281.1
3	1971	37.9	137.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	178.5	6650.9
4	1972	102.1	158.1	0.0	0.0	5.4	265.6	7187.5
5	1973	107.1	150.8	0.0	0.0	19.0	276.9	8630.5
6	1974	122.0	179.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	322.4	18823.1
7	1975	126.0	200.7	0.0	0.0	23.2	349.9	21475.2
8	1976	130.3	220.1	0.0	0.0	24.2	374.6	26655.8
9	1977	139.5	218.5	0.0	0.0	7.1	365.1	31520.3
10	1978	154.3	838.0	0.0	0.0	259.8	1252.1	34540.1
11	1979	163.9	1433.7	0.0	0.0	13.9	1611.5	41974.7
12	1980	179.1	1576.5	0.0	0.0	111.2	1866.8	49632.3
13	1981	179.6	1975.9	0.0	0.0	175.7	2331.2	47619.7
14	1982	530.4	5474.4	1981.7	0.0	832.9	8819.4	49069.3

15	1983	566.4	6002.2	2758.8	548.9	701.4	10577.7	53107.4
16	1984	1271.2	6360.4	5443.7	1155.1	578.3	14808.7	59622.5
17	1985	1293.5	7726.4	6164.3	1273.9	842.5	17300.6	67908.6
18	1986	4670.7	21725.3	8444.7	4152.6	2459.1	41452.4	69147.0
19	1987	8781.5	63205.6	6766.5	20634.7	1400.8	100789.1	105222.8
20	1988	9991.8	75445.3	14986.1	25742.1	7791.0	133956.3	139085.3
21	1989	21473.6	121229.6	42840.0	35067.6	19782.9	240393.7	216797.5
22	1990	34606.3	154550.6	53431.8	40950.5	15075.2	298614.4	267550.0
23	1991	39458.3	173051.2	58238.1	43561.9	14144.3	328453.8	312139.7
24	1992	89274.3	324729.9	41890.6	64140.0	24229.3	544264.1	532613.8
25	1993	81456.3	400380.9	45323.8	69665.7	36317.7	633144.4	683869.8
26	1994	97056.6	404212.6	45367.9	70069.1	32106.8	648813.0	899863.2
27	1995	97042.0	476731.2	44990.0	69256.0	28846.4	716865.6	1933211.6
28	1996	102630.0	420002	44946.0	47080.0	2662.0	617320.0	2702719.1
29	1997	96199.0	417568.8	44946.0	35475.9	1742.2	595931.9	2801972.6
30	1998	93214.0	458257.8	44946.0	35151.6	1447.6	633017.0	2708430.9
31	1999	361194.9	1885664.8	187627.1	136523.8	6363.8	2577374.4	3194015.0
32	2000	379043.0	2320269	223832.6	158486.0	15753.3	3097383.9	4582127.3
33	2001	313504.7	2475509.4	228950.2	144746.2	13580.5	3176291.0	4725086.0
34	2002	375700.1	3220823.5	182964.5	146341.1	7055.6	3932884.8	6912381.3
35	2003	413877.7	3737279.9	196156.9	123994.6	7020.2	4478329.3	8487031.6
36	2004	384248.7	4196844.6	196155.5	106558.4	6462.4	4890269.6	11411066.9
37	2005	330654.4	2028580.1	189768.4	85526.7	60542.6	2695072.2	14572239.1
38	2006	332219.2	0.0	0.0	64832.6	54409.9	451461.7	18564594.7
39	2007	360427.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	67631.1	428058.7	20657317.7
40	2008	382106.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	64450.7	446557.1	23842170.7
41	2009	394723.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	66231.2	450954.4	25786112.4

Source: CBN Statistical Bulletin for various years.

Research objective

The main objective of the study, as stated in section one, is to find out how the different components of external debt affect the economic development of Nigeria, represented by gross domestic product (GDP)

Model specification

Specifically we have;

GDP$_t$	=	Level of gross domestic product in year t
MULTILAT$_t$	=	Level of multilateral debt in year t.
PARCLUB$_t$	=	Level of Paris club debt in year t.
LONCLUB$_t$	=	Level of London club debt in year t.
PROMNOTES$_t$ =		Level of Promissory note debt in year t.
OTHERS$_t$	=	Level of other sources of debt in year t.

Thus, the functional form is given as:

GDP$_t$ = f(MULTILAT$_t$, PARCLUB$_t$, LONCLUB$_t$, PROMNOTE$_t$, OTHERS$_t$)............1

Mathematically, we have the regression equation as;

GDP$_t$ = β$_0$ + β$_1$MULTILAT$_t$ + β$_2$PARCLUB$_t$ + β$_3$LONCLUB$_t$ + β$_4$PROMNOTE$_t$ + β$_5$OTHERS$_t$ + U$_t$ 2

Where;

β$_{1>}$ 0; β$_{2>}$ 0; β$_{3}$ $_>$ 0; β4$_>$ 0; β$_{5>}$ 0

Data estimation: unit root tests

The unit root test is carried out using the Augmented Dickey Fuller test and Philip-Perron tests in order to determine whether the data set is stationary and the order of integration since many empirical researches conducted in the past utilizing only the OLS yielded spurious results especially in the developing countries (Engel and Granger, 1987). Evidently, from table 2, it is crystal-clear that all the variables (under ADF and Philip- Perron) turned out stationary at first difference or 1(1). Thus, meaning that the data set when at first difference can be relied upon for the estimation (see table1).Finally, the study employed the Granger causality test to measure the precedence and information content of the variables while the co-integration technique proved that a long-run relationship existed between the GDP and the

explanatory variables. Because the tests showed evidence of a causal relationship between past values of GDP and the current GDP, the one-year lagged GDP was therefore included as one of the explanatory variables (Egunjobi, 2007).

Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

Evidently from table 3, model 1still not being strong, necessitated the introduction of concept of Granger causality in order to confirm the effect of past values of the dependent variable in the model. This result is displayed as model 2 in table 3. The results of the global statistics (e.g., Durbin-Watson, 1.3261: Log likelihooh,-583.440: Akaike information criterion 29.52: F-statistic, 967.93: R-squared 99.4%,: Adjusted R-squared ,99.3%), are all evidence of the autocorrelation–free and hence high predictive power of model 2.

From the F-tables, since we read the following; F-tabulated (6, 35), 1%=3.12; 5%=2.25while the F-ratio calculated is 967.9263, the null hypothesis is rejected, as the F-calculated is more than the F-tabulated. Hence, there is a significant relationship between external debt and Nigeria's economic development., for the respective periods under investigation, 1969-2009 ,and the estimated regression equation is represented thus;

$$GDP_t = 162045.8 + 1.124111 LAGGDP_t + 4.544105 MULTILAT_t + 0.059451 PARCLUB_t - 10.90812 LONCLUB_t - 0.543563 PROMNOTE_t + 19.12825 OTHERS_t \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots 3$$

Table 2: Summary of Unit Root Test Results

Philip-Perron Unit Root Test					Augmented Dickey-Fuller Unit Root Test			
Variable	T-stat.	Criti-cal vale	Order of Integra-tion	Signifi-cance	T-stat.	Criti-cal value	Order of Integra-tion	Signifi-cance
MULTILAT	-6.2572	-3.6104	1(1)	1%	-5.9186	-3.6156	1(1)	1%
PARCLUB	-3.7203	-3.6105	1(1)	1%	-6.3711	-3.3711	1(1)	1%
LONCLUB	-54838	-3.6105	1(1)	1%	-4.8370	-3.6463	1(1)	1%
PROMNOTE	-4.5742	-3.16105	1(1)	1%	-4.5810	-3.6101	1(1)	1%
OTHERS	-6.6598	-3.6105	1(1)	1%	-6.6076	-3.6104	1(1)	1%

Table 3: Summary of the Results of the Global Statistics

TEST-STATISTIC	MODEL1 LEAST SQUARE	MODEL 2 LEAST SQUARE WITH LAG OF GDP
R-square	=0.393	=0.994
Adjusted R-square	=0.304	=0.993
S.E of Regression	=5876323	=575639.1
Sum of squared residual	=1.17E+15	=1.09E+13
Log likelihood	=-676.96	=-583.44
Durbin-Watson stat	=0.633720	=1.3261
Mean depend. var	=3915912	=3915912
S.D. depend. Var	=7044418	=7044418
Akaike info criterion	=34.15	=29.52
Schwarz criterion	=34.40	=29.82
Hannan-Quinn Criterion	=34.24	29.63
F-statistic	=4.4092	963.93
Prob(F-statistic)	=0.003347	0.0000000

Source: Researchers' computation using Eviews Statistical Package

Constant	=	162045.8
No of observations	=	41
Degree of freedom	=	(6, 35)

Hypotheses Testing: The Impact of External Debt Explanatory Variables on Economic Development

Furthermore, only two of the explanatory variables (lagged values of the GDP and debt from the London club) turned out significant at 1% and 5% levels of significance respectively. More worrisome are the signs of the individual coefficients, just as both the London club debt and promissory notes bear negative coefficients, thus, negative contributions to the level of economic development in Nigeria, within the study period. This obviously

stands to question the rationale behind contracting more external debt in Nigeria. (See table 4).

Table 4: Regression Output of external debt sources and gross domestic product.

Independent variable	X_1 Lagged Value of GDP, LAGGDP	X_2 Multilateral Debt, MULTILAT⁴	X_3 Paris club debt, DPARCLUB$_t$	X_4 London Club Debt, LONCLUB$_t$	X_5 Promissory Notes ,PROMNOTE$_t$	X_6 Other Souces Of External Debt, OTHERS$_t$
Coefficient of the Variables	1.124111	4.544105	0.0594451	-10.90812	-0.543563	19.12825
Standard error	0.018973	3.432211	0.3365525	4.399336	7.543002	12.72655
T-statistic calculated	59.246543 ***	1.323959 NS	0.176662 NS	-2.479492 **	-0.072062 NS	1.503020 NS
T-statistic Tabulated 1%	2.704	2.704	2.704	2.704	2.704	2.704

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the findings, it shows that for the period 1969 to 2009 external debts generally did not contribute positively to the economy of Nigeria. Multilateral, Paris Club, Promissory notes and other external sources of debt were found not significant towards the promotion of economic development. While the London Club debts were negatively significant it was only the past values of GDP, taken as an independent variable that was positively significant. Reasons for these interesting results are not far fetched. That most types of the external debts did not contribute positively to economic development of Nigeria is in line with economic reasoning of crowding out of productive loans to the private sector. In addition, most of the loans were reportedly stashed away in foreign accounts while "goods" like toothpicks and, at times, ordinary sand were alleged to be imported as tractor parts and other capital goods. Again, even if they contributed positively when the quantum was relatively less, as the burden increased, the negative impact started and increased.

It is, therefore, not in the interest of the country to start moves that would increase the external debt stock only few years of exiting from the Paris Club

at a high cost. In line with this, the Debt Management Office should be strengthened and the plans of establishing similar bodies in all states of the federation pursued with vigour. It is further recommended that external loans should only be taken if needed in critical capital expenditure areas that must be strictly monitored. It is not in the interest of the country that external debts that stood at 3.54 billion dollars by end of 2006 (after exit from Paris Club) is gradually climbing to 4.3 bullion dollars by end of March 2010. At the same time, the Federal Government is further seeking for over 4.4 billion dollars of external loan to help it fund the 2010 budget deficit.

References

Adegbite, E.O, Ayadi, F.S. and Ayadi, F.O. (2008), The Impact of Nigeria's external debt on Economic Development", *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, Vol. 3 Iss 3 Pp. 285 – 301.

Adopoju A.A, Salau, A.S and Obayelu, A. E. (2007) "The Effects of External Debt Management on Sustainable Economic Growth and Development: Lessons from Nigeria", *Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MPRA),* Paper No. 2147. http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchenide2147).

Ajayi, S.I. and Khan, M (2006), *External Debt and Capital Flight in Sub-Sahara Africa,* Washington.

Akujuobi, L.E. (2006), *Investment Analysis* Owerri, Adyudo Press.

Akujuobi, L.E. and Kalu, I.U. (2009), "State Government Finances and Real Asset Investments: The Nigerian Experience." The African Journal of Accounting, Economics, Finance and Banking Research (AJAEBF) vol.4 (4) July(pp1-11) ISSN 1933-3463, http://wwwglobip.com/africanjournal.htm.

Akujuobi, L.E. and Onuorah, A.C (2007), "Debts and Economic Development in Nigeria", *Journal of Research in National Development,* Vol. 5, No 2 pp 36 – 43.

Amakom, U.S. (2003), "Nigeria Public Debt and Economic Growth: an Empirical Assessment of Effects on Poverty", *African Institute for Applied Economics August.*

Borenstan L. (1990) Cited in Desta, M. G. (2005), "External Debt and Economic Growth in Ethiopia"., African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP) http://www.unidep.org.

Clements, B., Bhattacharya, R. and Nguyen, T.Q. (2005), "Can Debt Relief Boost Growth in Poor Countries?" *Economic Issues* No. 34, *International Monetary Fund.*

Engel, R. and Granger, C. (1987), Co-integration and Error Correction: Representation an Estimation and Testing, Econometrics, 55.

Elbadawai, I. (1992), Macroeconomic Management and Black Market for Foreign Exchange in Sudan. Policy Research Working Paper, WPS859, The World Bank.

Elbadawi, et. al. (1996), Cited in Desta, M.G. (2005) "External Debt and Economic Growth in Ethiopia", African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP) http://www.unidep.org.

Hansen, H. (2001), "The Impact of Aid and External Debt on Growth and Investment Insights from Cross Country Regression Analysis", *WIDER Development Conference on Debt Relief,* Helsinki, 17-18 August.

Iyoha, M.A. (1999), "External Debt and Economic Growth in Sub-Shara African Countries: An Econometric Study" *African Economic Research Consortium,* www.aercafrica.org.

King, D. T. (2003), USAID/Nigeria Economic Growth Activities Assessment (Transition Summary Report), Arlington: IBM Business Consulting Services.

Koeda, J. (2006), "A Debt Overhang Model for low-income Countries: Implications for Debt Relief" IMF working paper No WP/06/224.

Krugman, I. (1989) Cited in Dieta, M.G. (2005) "External Debt and Economic Growth in Ethiopia", African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP) http://www.unidep.org.

Okonjo Iweala N. (2003), "The Debt Trap in Nigeria: Towards a Sustainable Debt Strategy, Asmara, African World Press Incorporated.

Oxfam (1998), Cited in Amakan, U.S. (2003) Nigeria Public Debt and Economic Growth: An Empirical Assessment of Effects on Poverty, African Institute for Applied Economics.

Soludo, C.C. (2003), "Debt, Poverty and Inequality" in Okonjo-Iweala, Soludo and Muhtar (Eds), *The Debt Trap In Nigeria,* Africa World Press NJ. PP 23-74.

Todaro, M.P and Smith, S.C. (2006), *Economic Development* (8 ed), London: Pearson Education Ltd.

Pattillo, C. Ricci, L. and Poirson, H (2002), "External Debt and Growth", IMF Working Paper International Monetary Fund, Washington D.C.

Were, M. (2001), "The Impact of External Debt on Economic Growth and Private Investments in Kenya: an Empirical Assessment" Paper presented at WIDER Development Conference on Debts Relief, 17-18 August 2001. Helsinki, Canada