

## Energy performance and Environmental degradation in Nigeria and Ghana

MUHAMMAD BILYAMINU ADO  
Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano

### Abstract

*This study examines effect of energy performance, GDP, financial sector development and FDI on environmental degradation in Nigeria and Ghana, using FMOLS method from 1980 to 2019. The outcome of the cointegration tests reveal a long run link among the variables. The outcome from long run result shows that energy use, financial performance and FDI increase environmental degradation. Therefore, the study suggest rightful policies with the purpose of reducing the capacity of environmental pollution through measures that will promote credit allocation, less emission energy use like thermal and solar energy. It is essential for governments, policymakers and stakeholders to educate on dangers of the CO<sub>2</sub> explosion and to promote awareness on the ways to reduce the emissions among its citizens through public lectures and seminars for clean and better environment.*

**Keywords:** Energy, financial performance, FDI, CO<sub>2</sub>, FMOLS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The global CO<sub>2</sub> explosion is worrisome to nation's sustainable economic development (Sehrawat et al., 2015). In recent time, the percentage of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge from developing and emerging nations is increasing to the threat level of environmental quality (Meratizaman et al., 2015; Nejat et al., 2015). It is argued that CO<sub>2</sub> discharge has risen to 32 billion kt with almost 3.3 percent increment yearly (EIA, 2016). From 2010 to 2019 energy use have accelerates the level of the world's CO<sub>2</sub> explosion to the tune of 36.2 % (Global Carbon Project, 2018). Countries such as India, China and Africa have contributed to 63% of the total global CO<sub>2</sub>

explosion. (Hansen and Sato 2016; IPCC 2014). Therefore, the vulnerability effect of CO<sub>2</sub> explosion will be high in the emerging nations. These could generate problems like drought, low production of agricultural output, diseases outbreak and the alteration of the ecosystem that affect human development. (Danlami, Applanaidu, and Islam 2018).

Sub Saharan Africa (SSA) today are among nations with increasing level of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge due economic progression, population growth and energy use (Asongu 2018; Yahaya, Mohd-jali, and Raji 2020). The level of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge in SSA reached an increase of 0.84 billion tons yearly (WDI 2017). For instance, CO<sub>2</sub> release in Nigeria and Ghana have increased by 17,110.22 kt and 3,868.68 kt from 2000 to 2015 (WDI, 2017). It is further indicate that energy performance in these nation have risen by 0.11million kg of oil equivalent, 0.1kg and 0.36 kg of oil equivalent from 2000 to 2015, respectively. (WDI, 2017). Thus, this condition may have linked with increasing level of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge in the nation. Hence, the study analyze the effect of energy performance, GDP, financial sector development and FDI on environmental degradation in Nigeria and Ghana.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

The link among energy performance, financial, GDP and FDI were discussed in the literature. for instance, BOLük and Mert (2014) conducts an estimate for 16 EU nations to analyze the performance of energy on CO<sub>2</sub> using fixed effect approach from 1990 to 2008. They finds that energy utilization accelerates the explosion of CO<sub>2</sub>. Mahdi (2015) used PVAR technique to estimate the effect of energy utilization on CO<sub>2</sub> for European and Asian nation from 1989 to 2011. He found energy use increases the capacity of CO<sub>2</sub> explosion. Similarly, Begum et al. (2015) stressed that in Malaysia use of energy resources upsurge CO<sub>2</sub> discharge. Study by Mirzaei and Bekri (2017) justify their work by estimating the effect of energy performance on CO<sub>2</sub> in Iran. The outcome reveals energy resources increases CO<sub>2</sub>. Danish et al. (2018) evaluate the performance of energy resources on the CO<sub>2</sub> explosion in Pakistan. They reveals energy accelerate the level of CO<sub>2</sub>. Yahaya, Iro, and Kabiru (2019) studied the impact of fossil fuel for Nigeria. They discovered that energy upsurge the capacity of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge.

Nevertheless, Nguyen and Kakinaka (2019) argued that energy utilization in 170 nations reduce the level of CO<sub>2</sub> explosion. Yahaya, Adamu, and Mustapha (2020) utilize ARDL approach to estimate the impact of energy resource in Nigeria. It finds a positive link among energy and CO<sub>2</sub>.

Moreover, Sehrawat, Giri, and Mohapatra (2015) documents that financial resources in India upsurge the capacity of CO<sub>2</sub> explosion. Javid and Sharif (2016) stressed that in Pakistan development of financial sector accelerates the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge. However, Zafar, Saud, and Hou (2019) estimate the performance of financial development on CO<sub>2</sub> in OECD nations using FMOLS method. They find financial progress reduce the release of CO<sub>2</sub>. In another dimension, Shahbaz, Mutascu, and Azim (2014) examine the influence of output performance on CO<sub>2</sub> in Romania by applying ARDL approach. The result shows that output performance increases CO<sub>2</sub>. Cetin and Ecevit (2017) argued that GDP in Turkey accelerates the capacity of CO<sub>2</sub> release. Similarly, Sulaiman and Abdul-Rahim (2017) discover same outcome in Malaysia that energy use upsurge the release of CO<sub>2</sub>. Nonetheless, study by Acheampong (2018) using PVAR analysis emphasized that industrial growth performance decelerates the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> level in 116 emerging economies. Moreover, Ren et al. (2014) utilize GMM technique to evaluate the effect of FDI on CO<sub>2</sub> in China from 2000 to 2010. They stressed that FDI increase the level of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge. Gökmenoğlu and Taspınar (2016) argued that FDI and energy resources in Turkey upsurge the level of CO<sub>2</sub> explosion. This result is supported by previous outcome (Shao 2018). Based on the reviewed literature linkage among energy performance and environmental degradation have been analyzed. However, relationship among these variable have very limited studies in Nigeria and Ghana. Hence, the study examine the effect of energy performance and environmental pollution in Nigeria and Ghana.

### **3. DATA AND TECHNIQUE OF ESTIMATION**

#### **3.1 Data**

Yearly data for Ghana and Nigeria on environmental degradation (CO<sub>2</sub>), energy performance (kg of oil), financial progress (credits percentage of GDP) GDP (percapita current USD) and FDI (net inflow) from 1980 to 2019. Data was obtained from WDI. The statistical

description of the variables are illustrated in table 1. It indicates that environmental degradation have the highest mean variation of 6.7 and FDI with lowest mean value of 3.6.

**Table 1. Data description**

| Variables | Min  | Max  | Mean | SD   |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| LENV      | 3.40 | 5.70 | 6.72 | 0.76 |
| LEP       | 1.06 | 1.95 | 1.55 | 0.30 |
| LGDP      | 1.21 | 9.99 | 4.48 | 3.66 |
| LFD       | 0.79 | 1.65 | 1.42 | 0.14 |
| LFDI      | 0.48 | 9.52 | 3.67 | 3.18 |

### 3.2 Model specification

The study used a model modified by Salahuddin et al. (2015) in order to estimate the long run confidents of the variables and it is illustrates based on the econometric specification in equation 1.

$$ENV_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 EP_{it} + \beta_2 GDP_{it} + \beta_3 FD_{it} + \beta_4 FDI_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

From equation 1, ENV, EP, GDP, FD and FDI, indicate environmental degradation, energy performance, GDP, financial progress and foreign direct investment,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  represents the parameter in the model,  $t$  illustrate time,  $i$  shows each nation entity and  $\varepsilon$  signifies the error term. It expected that  $(\beta_1 \beta_2 \beta_3 \beta_4 \beta_5 > 0)$ .

## 4. RESULT

The stationarity tests outcome is illustrated in this part, cointegration and the model's estimation. Table 2 shows that the variables from both IPS and LLC tests reveals stationarity at the first difference.

**Table 2 stationarity tests**

| Variables | Level  |         | LLC    |         | First Dif. |         | LLC      |         |
|-----------|--------|---------|--------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|
|           | IPS    |         |        |         | IPS        |         |          |         |
| LCO2      | -0.036 | (0.485) | -0.896 | (0.184) | -3.193*    | (0.007) | -0.994*  | (0.000) |
| LEU       | 0.064  | (0.525) | -0.115 | (0.453) | -6.222*    | (0.000) | -0.453** | (0.074) |
| LFD       | -0.449 | (0.326) | -1.221 | (0.110) | -6.306*    | (0.000) | -5.725*  | (0.000) |
| LIND      | -0.852 | (0.197) | -2.258 | (0.320) | -7.824*    | (0.000) | -8102*   | (0.000) |
| LFDI      | 0.385  | (0.649) | -0.157 | (0.437) | -5.365*    | (0.000) | -3.913*  | (0.000) |

Note: \*\*\* and \*\* signifies 1 and 5 % significance.

Table 3 presents the outcome of the cointegration tests. It reveals the confirmation of long run linkage among the variables. Hence, this condition validate the use of the FMOLS technique.

**Table 3 cointegration tests result**

| Test                              | Statistics | Prob. | Weighted statistics | Prob. |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|---------------------|-------|
| <b>Pedroni cointegration test</b> |            |       |                     |       |
| Panel u-statistics                | 0.656      | 0.255 | 1.031               | 0.151 |
| Panel ρ statistics                | -0.020     | 0.491 | -0.012              | 0.495 |
| Panel PP-statistics               | -1.873**   | 0.030 | -1.402*             | 0.080 |
| Panel ADF-statistics              | -2.062*    | 0.019 | -1.545*             | 0.061 |
| Group ρ-statistics                | 0.637      | 0.738 |                     |       |
| Group PP-statistics               | -2.993***  | 0.001 |                     |       |
| Group ADF-statistics              | -1.558**   | 0.059 |                     |       |
| <b>Kao cointegration test</b>     |            |       |                     |       |
| ADF                               | -1.975***  | 0.024 |                     |       |

Note: \*\*\*, \*\* and \* denotes 1, 5 and 10 % significance

Table 4, illustrate the estimates of FMOLS outcome. It reveals a positive link among energy performance and environmental degradation that is in these nations, energy use increase the environmental pollution. It entails that a one percent increase in energy performance results to 1.6 percent increase in environmental degradation. Therefore, the implication is that 1.6 percent increase in environmental degradation due increase in energy performance. Thus, governments and policymakers should design rightful policies to mitigate the discharge of CO<sub>2</sub> for better environment. This outcome is similar with the result reported by past studies (Bölük and Mert 2014). Similarly, the outcome indicates that GDP, financial progress and FDI have also influence environmental degradation positively. This means that a one percent increase in GDP, financial sector development and FDI result to 1.1, 1.1 and 0.1 rise in environmental degradation. The outcome is similar with result of the earlier studies (Sehrawat, Giri, and Mohapatra 2015).

**Table 4 FMOLS estimates result**

| Variables | Coefficients     | t-statistics |
|-----------|------------------|--------------|
| LEP       | 2.610*** (0.002) | 3.835        |
| LGDP      | 1.190*** (0.001) | 3.240        |
| LFD       | 1.144 (0.139)    | -1.490       |
| LFDI      | 0.113*** (0.001) | 3.974        |

Note: \*\*\* and \*\* shows 1 and 5 % significance

Table 5 presents the model validity check and it illustrate that the disturbance errors are correctly distributed in the model.

**Table 5 Post estimation test**

| Test Type   | F-statistics | Probability | Result               |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Jarque-Bera | 4.2451       | 0.2614      | Normally Distributed |

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study examines the effect of energy performance, GDP, financial sector development and FDI Nigeria and Ghana, using FMOLS method from 1980 to 2019. The outcome of the Pedroni and Kao panel cointegration endorse the long run association on the variables. The FMOLS result reveal that energy performance, GDP, financial sector development and FDI accelerate the level of environmental degradation. Therefore, the study suggests appropriate policies with the design goals of mitigating CO<sub>2</sub>, especially with the measures that will enhance credit allocation, promoting zero emission energy use such as (thermal, solar and wind energy) and technologies. This could be through giving instructions to financial institutions that credits should be allocated to the purchases of low emission energy and technologies, putting restrictions and control measures on the credit allocation, enhancing rural banking system as well as setting out legal institutions that will oversee and audit all aspect with regard to this mandate. It is essential for governments, policymakers and stakeholders to expose dangers of the CO<sub>2</sub> explosion and to promote awareness on the ways to reduce the emissions among its citizens through public lectures and seminars for clean and better environment. The limitations of the study, it is clear that other determinant of CO<sub>2</sub> discharge are not captured for the reason that some of these factor have no data especially disaggregated energy variables. Hence, future research should focus on other disaggregates of energy variables to incorporate in the models.

## REFERENCES

1. Acheampong, Alex O. 2018. "Economic Growth, CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions and Energy Consumption: What Causes What and Where?" *Energy Economics* 74. Elsevier B.V.: 677–92. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2018.07.022.
2. Asongu, Simplice A. 2018. "CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Thresholds for Inclusive Human Development in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 25 (26). Environmental Science and Pollution Research: 26005–19.

3. Begum, Rawshan Ara, Kazi Sohag, Syed Sharifah Mastura Abullah, and Mokhtar Jaafar. 2015. "CO 2 Emissions , Energy Consumption , Economic and Population Growth in Malaysia." *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 41. Elsevier: 594–601. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.205.
4. BÖlük, Gülden, and Mehmet Mert. 2014. "Fossil & Renewable Energy Consumption , GHGs ( Greenhouse Gases ) and Economic Growth : Evidence from a Panel of EU ( European Union ) Countries." *Energy* 74: 439–46. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2014.07.008.
5. Cetin, Murat, and Eyup Ecevit. 2017. "The Impact of Financial Development on Carbon Emissions under the Structural Breaks : Empirical Evidence from Turkish Economy." *International Journal of Economics Perspective* 11 (1): 64–78.
6. Danish, Bin Zhang, Zhaohua Wang, and Bo Wang. 2018. "Energy Production, Economic Growth and CO2 Emission: Evidence from Pakistan." *Natural Hazards* 90 (1). Springer Netherlands: 27–50. doi:10.1007/s11069-017-3031-z.
7. Danlami, Abubakar Hamid, Shri-Dewi Applanaidu, and Rabiul Islam. 2018. "Movement towards a Low Carbon Emitted Environment: A Test of Some Factors in Malaysia." *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 20 (3). Springer Netherlands: 1085–1102. doi:10.1007/s10668-017-9927-7.
8. Global Carbon Project. 2018. "Supplemental Data of Global Carbon Budget." Australia.
9. Gökmenoğlu, Korhan, and Nigar Taspınar. 2016. "The Relationship between Co 2 Emissions , Energy Consumption , Economic Growth and FDI : The Case of Turkey." *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* 25 (5): 706–23. doi:10.1080/09638199.2015.1119876.
10. Hansen, J, and M Sato. 2016. "Regional Climate Change and National Responsibilities." *Environmental Research Letters* 11 (3): 034009.
11. IEA. 2016. "Energy and Air Pollution." *International Energy Agency, World Energy Outlook - Special Report. Paris.* doi:10.1021/ac00256a010.
12. IPCC. 2014. "Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change." Geneva, Switzerland.
13. Javid, Muhammad, and Fatima Sharif. 2016. "Environmental Kuznets Curve and Financial Development in Pakistan." *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 54. Elsevier: 406–14. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.019.
14. Mahdi, Ziaei Sayyed. 2015. "Effects of Financial Development Indicators on Energy Consumption and CO2 Emission of European, East Asian and Oceania Countries." *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 42. Elsevier: 752–59. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2014.10.085.
15. Meratizaman, Mousa, Sina Monadizadeh, Omid Pourali, and Majid Amidpour. 2015. "High Efficient-Low Emission Power Production from Low BTU Gas Extracted from Heavy Fuel Oil Gasification, Introduction of IGCC-SOFC Process." *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering* 23. Elsevier B.V: 1–15. doi:10.1016/j.jngse.2015.01.023.
16. Mirzaei, Maryam, and Mahmoud Bekri. 2017. "Energy Consumption and CO2emissions in Iran, 2025." *Environmental Research* 154. Elsevier: 345–51. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.01.023.

17. Nejat, Payam, Fatemeh Jomehzadeh, Mohammad Mahdi Taheri, Mohammad Gohari, and Muhd Zaimi Muhd. 2015. "A Global Review of Energy Consumption, CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions and Policy in the Residential Sector (with an Overview of the Top Ten CO<sub>2</sub> Emitting Countries)." *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 43. Elsevier: 843–62. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2014.11.066.
18. Nguyen, Kim Hanh, and Makoto Kakinaka. 2019. "Renewable Energy Consumption, Carbon Emissions, and Development Stages: Some Evidence from Panel Cointegration Analysis." *Renewable Energy* 132. Elsevier B.V.: 1049–57. doi:10.1016/j.renene.2018.08.069.
19. Ren, Shenggang, Baolong Yuan, Xie Ma, and Xiaohong Chen. 2014. "International Trade , FDI ( Foreign Direct Investment ) and Embodied CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions : A Case Study of Chinas Industrial Sectors." *China Economic Review* 28. Elsevier Inc.: 123–34. doi:10.1016/j.chieco.2014.01.003.
20. Salahuddin, Mohammad, Jeff Gow, and Ilhan Ozturk. 2015. "Is The Long-Run Relationship between Economic Growth, Electricity Consumption, Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Financial Development in Gulf Cooperation Council Countries Robust?" *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 51. Elsevier: 317–26. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.06.005.
21. Sehrawat, Madhu, A.K. Giri, and Geetilaxmi Mohapatra. 2015. "The Impact of Financial Development , Economic Growth and Energy Consumption on Environmental Degradation: Evidence from India." *Management of Environmental Quality* 26 (5): 666–82. doi:10.1108/MEQ-05-2014-0063.
22. Shahbaz, Muhammad, Mihai Mutascu, and Parvez Azim. 2014. "Environmental Kuznets Curve in Romania and the Role of Energy Consumption." *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 18 (January 2007). Elsevier: 165–73. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2012.10.012.
23. Shao, Yanmin. 2018. "Does FDI a Ffect Carbon Intensity ? New Evidence from Dynamic Panel Analysis." *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management* 10 (1): 27–42. doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-03-2017-0062.
24. Sulaiman, Chindo, and A.S. Abdul-Rahim. 2017. "The Relationship Between CO<sub>2</sub> Emission , Energy Consumption and Economic Growth in Malaysia : A Three-Way Linkage Approach." *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 24 (32). Environmental Science and Pollution Research: 25204–20. doi:10.1007/s11356-017-0092-1.
25. WDI. 2017. "World Development Indicators : Energy Dependency , Efficiency and Carbon Dioxide Emissions." Washington, DC.
26. Yahaya, Nura Sani, Sanusi Adamu, and Aminu Muhammad Mustapha. 2020. "Energy Production and CO<sub>2</sub> Emission in Nigeria." *Academic Journal of Economics Studies* 6 (1): 110–14.
27. Yahaya, Nura Sani, Hadiza Nasir Iro, and Sunusi Kabiru. 2019. "Fossil Fuel Energy Consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions in Nigeria." *Academic Journal of Economics Studies* 5 (2): 173–78.
28. Yahaya, Nura Sani, Mohd Razani Mohd-jali, and Jimoh Olajide Raji. 2020. "The Role of Financial Development and Corruption in Environmental Degradation of Sub-Saharan African Countries." *Management of Environmental Quality: An Internal Journal*. doi:10.1108/MEQ-09-2019-0190.



29. Zafar, Muhammad Wasif, Shah Saud, and Fujun Hou. 2019. "The Impact of Globalization and Financial Development on Environmental Quality : Evidence from Selected Countries in the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development ( OECD )." *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 26 (13). Environmental Science and Pollution Research: 13246–62.